THE

DUBLIN REVIEW.

JUNE, 1858.

ART. I.—*The Judges of England;* with Sketches of their Lives, from the time of the Conquest. Vols. 1–6, containing the Reigns from William I. to Elizabeth inclusive. By Edward Foss, F.S.A. London: Longmans.

IT is somewhat surprising that until this work was commenced no attempt had been made to present any complete series of the Lives of the Judges. This, indeed, is partly explainable by the arduous character of the task, of which the work before us is an evidence. For ten years have elapsed since the first of these six volumes appeared, and as we gather from the preface, probably from ten to twenty years had been previously occupied in the necessary researches, whilst at least as many volumes more will be necessary to complete the work. Writers of this character, who bestow such time, such labour, such patience, and such perseverance "for the accurate execution of a great work, are in our age very rare; and it is happy for our legal literature that the Lives of our Judges should have been undertaken by such a man as Mr. Foss. We happen to know that the highest opinion is entertained of his work by those who are best qualified to judge of it, the judges of our own day; and the writer of this article has cited it as a work of authority in the court where Lord Campbell presides, when his Lordship recognized the learning and the accuracy of his literary rival.

The work of Mr. Foss is infinitely more accurate and complete in its execution, although it is so much more comprehensive in its scope, than the Lives of Lord Camp-

bell, which cannot be compared with those of Mr. Foss, as regards correctness. It has been evidently the desire of Mr. Foss to adhere as closely as possible to the truth of history, and he scorns to sacrifice it for the sake of a telling story. We would that all historical writers were equally conscientious. And this work is an evidence that the plain truth has after all the most real and enduring interest. It is not the less entertaining because it is trustworthy. It is a collection of biographies, replete with interest, and enriched with an abundance of incident and curious illustrations of the manners of ancient times. The chief interest of the work, especially for Catholics, centres in the lives of the Chancellors, who during the period comprised in the five first volumes, were mostly ecclesiastics, and among the most distinguished prelates of their age. It is a happy circumstance, and of itself would entitle the work to our respectful attention, (even if its own merits did not do so,) that the author has written in a tone so worthy of a work of such enduring interest and such permanent value. Thus, in speaking of Lanfranc, the first Archbishop of Canterbury after the Conquest, he says:—

"He was not only willingly accepted by the monks and approved by the barons and people, but gladly confirmed by the Pope. He was accordingly consecrated, in 1070, and on visiting Rome in the following year, to receive the pall, he was welcomed with particular respect by his former pupil, Alexander II., who rose to give him audience, kissed him instead of presenting his slipper for that obeisance, and not satisfied with giving him the usual pall, invested him with that which he had himself used in celebrating mass. On his return from Rome he devoted himself strenuously to the duties of his office, and laboured successfully in reforming the irregularities and rudeness of his clergy. His severity in depriving many occasioned considerable complaints, *but the introduction of foreign scholars in their places contributed effectually to the enlightenment of the nation.*"

The latter part of this passage will, we are sure, commend itself to our readers as a remarkable and creditable victory over English prejudice against "foreign" ecclesiastics; a prejudice perhaps the most deep-rooted of any that has ever characterized our country; which is apparent in every page of the contemporary chronicler; which is embodied in the anti-papal statutes of the middle ages; which was made use of to promote the sad schism, and is

perpetuated to this day in the oaths imposed by Parliament.

It is observable in those brief but pregnant biographies of bishops, of which this work is full, how very early after the Conquest the crown began to encroach upon the Church in regard to the nominations to the episcopate. The Conqueror appears to have been too wise to abuse the privilege of nomination, conceded by the courtesy of the Apostolic See; but his son, the depraved Rufus, did so most grossly, as Mr. Foss shows in his interesting life of the unscrupulous Ranulph Flambard.

"This extraordinary man was a Norman of the lowest extraction, whose mother had the reputation of being a witch, and of conversing with demons. He followed the court of the Conqueror into England, and having entered into holy orders, obtained from that prince the church of Godalming. He next received a prebend in the Church of Lincoln, and the deanery of Christ Church in Hampshire, and became chaplain to the Bishop of London. By the favour of that prelate the prebend of Totenhall, in the Church of St. Paul, was added to his preferments, but not satisfied with these pluralities, he demanded the vacant deanery of that cathedral from his benefactor, and indignant at his refusal left his service."

By what means he passed into the household of William Rufus does not appear, but it is not unlikely that he held an office in the Chancery, and Malmsbury's description of him as *invictus causidicus*, shows he was connected with the courts. He is next found, however, as one of the king's chaplains. "It was not long before he contrived to ingratiate himself with his sovereign. During the life of Archbishop Lanfranc the rapacious disposition of Rufus was under restraint, but after the death of that wise and excellent man, 1089, his profuseness of extravagance exhausted the treasury. Ranulph soon discovered the character of his royal master, and saw that he could best serve his own ambitious views by flattering the vices and feeding the avarice of the king. Unprincipled himself, he did not hesitate to recommend measures which, however oppressive to the people or disreputable to the crown, would produce the desired object of filling the royal coffers. By his suggestion new offices were created for the sake of the fines which followed them, &c. Not content with this he drew down upon himself the deepest indignation of the clergy, by suggesting to the king that on the death of

any dignitary of the Church, whether bishop or abbot, the temporalities devolved to the crown till the vacancy was supplied. The king was not slow in acting upon this advice, and the injurious effect on the ecclesiastical revenues may be easily conceived."

This, however, was the *least* of the evils it produced. It had a most pernicious effect on the character of the episcopate, and on the welfare of the Church.

"This will readily account for the long periods allowed to elapse between the death of a bishop and the appointment of his successor, and also for the fact that on the death of the king there were not less than one archbishopric, four bishoprics, and eleven abbeys vacant."

But even this was not the worst of the evils that ensued. The history of Flambard itself illustrates the result.

"Flambard, as may be supposed, obtained the custody of several of these vacant bishoprics. In 1083 the abbey of Winchester, in 1089 the archbishopric of Canterbury, and in 1092 the bishopric of Lincoln, and the abbey of Chester were entrusted to him, and by the spoil of these churches and the pressure of their tenants, he did not fail to enrich himself. To these modes of imposition he added another device to supply the royal wants. When any of these vacancies were at last filled up, he made a simoniacal contract for the king with the candidate, compelling him to pay a large sum before he was instituted."

In this way it was that he himself at last obtained the bishopric of Durham.

"Three years and a half had nearly elapsed since the death of William de Carilefo, its last incumbent; and the king profiting by the lessons his minister had taught, made him feel the effect in his own person, by compelling him to pay £1,000 for his advancement."

Who can wonder that St. Anselm, who, by the bye never held any civil office, and was a most rare exception among the prelates of that age, a primate who was not chancellor, who can wonder that St. Anselm should have set his face against this monstrous abuse? It was his refusal of a similar gift to the rapacious monarch, on his election to the primacy, that first involved him in that struggle with the crown, in which he won the glory of the confessor, if not the martyr.

Of that William of Carilefo, whom Flambard succeeded, Mr. Foss records, that he endeavoured to ingratiate him-

self with the king, by taking part against the Archbishop Anselm, not however without a suspicion of being influenced by the hope to succeed to the archbishopric.

There is an amusing anecdote bearing upon this subject, in the biography of Bloet, bishop of Lincoln.

"He is said to have owed his early advance to the prelacy to William's compunction during a serious illness. Oppressed with the memory of his evil life, and particularly of his extortions from the Church, the royal penitent resolved to fill up the vacant bishoprics, which he had long held in his hands. Bloet, though he benefited by the immediate appointment, found upon the king's recovery that his good resolutions were forgotten, and was compelled to pay large sums, from £500 to £5,000, varying, according to different authors, as the price of his advancement."

This simoniacal prelate was in the king's company on the occasion of a royal hunt, when he was struck with apoplexy, and falling off his horse, was carried to his bed and died.

We read something better of Giffard, bishop of Winchester:

"At the coronation, or soon after the accession of Henry, he had been nominated to the vacant bishopric of Winchester, but his consecration had been prevented at first by the absence of Archbishop Anselm, and then by that prelate's refusal to perform the ceremony upon him and several others then appointed, unless the king would give up the right of investiture, which had been gradually assumed by the crown. After many ineffectual attempts to induce Anselm to comply, Henry endeavoured to counteract his refusal by employing Giffard, Archbishop of York, for that purpose; but, Giffard fearing that this would lead to his excommunication, declined to avail himself of the office; and by so doing, turned the royal anger against himself, and was not only dismissed from his office, but was banished from the realm. He accompanied Anselm to Rome in 1103. It is remarkable that in none of his signatures after his nomination to the bishopric, does he make any allusion to it. The dispute between the king and Anselm lasted for the four following years, and was then terminated by mutual concessions; the king giving up the claim to invest with the crozier and ring, and being allowed to retain the more important right of receiving the fealty and homage of the bishops for their temporal possessions."

Our readers will remark two curious and considerable blunders of Mr. Foss; first, in imagining that the homage for the temporal possessions was "more important" than

the conferring of spiritual jurisdiction, signified by the crozier and the ring: a most amusing illustration of the unconscious tendency of Protestants to exalt the temporal over the spiritual. Henry of England and Henry of Germany, knew better; they knew that they had struggled for *the right to confer the symbols of jurisdiction.* This the popes succeeded in retaining. And the second blunder of Mr. Foss is, in supposing that there was any compromise. The sole dispute had been about the crozier and ring, the symbols of the spiritual; not at all about the temporal.

"The accommodation was arranged in 1107, and in that year, on August 11, Anselm solemnly consecrated seven bishops, William Giffard being among the number. He presided over his see for nearly twenty-one years, during which period he performed many acts to make his rule remembered. He introduced the Cistercian monks into England, and founded an abbey for them at Wainesley, in Surrey. He was the founder and principal contributor to the priory of St. Mary Olny, in Southwark, and built the magnificent mansion there, which was so long the residence of his successors when in London. He held the office of Chancellor five times, under three kings."

The story of Roger, bishop of Salisbury, who succeeded Giffard in the chancellorship, is more amusing, but less edifying.

"He was a curate of a small church near Caen, in Normandy, and ingratiated himself with Henry by the celerity with which he dispatched the service when the prince and his followers chanced to be present. From that time he became attached to the fortunes of the prince. He became an active and zealous servant, and by dexterous management of whatever business he was engaged in, so endeared himself to Henry during his adversity, that when he mounted the throne of England, he not only enriched him with many preferments, but advanced him to the highest employments."

He became ultimately chancellor. But another king arose who knew not Roger, and it fared hardly with him under King Stephen, who suspected, or pretended to suspect, that he was favourable to the cause of Matilda.

"He determined to seize his castles and property on the first opportunity. This was soon contrived. The reluctant bishop was compelled to attend a council, when the king required him, upon some pretence, to give up his castles as pledges of his fealty, and thereupon committed him and his son Roger to close custody until

this should have been done. His nephew Nigel, bishop of Ely, suspecting to what these proceedings tended, fled, and shut himself up in his uncle's castle of Devizes, which he refused to surrender. The king immediately marched thither, taking his prisoners with him, and having erected a gibbet in front of the walls, pronounced, in the presence of Bishop Roger, sentence of death upon his son, which he declared should be forthwith executed, unless the gates were opened to him. Nigel, regardless of the entreaties of his uncle, persisted in his refusal, and the king directed the sentence to be executed. The victim ascended the scaffold, and the rope was adjusted, when Bishop Roger, horrified that his son should be so murdered, threw himself at the king's feet, and bound himself by an oath, if his son were saved, to taste no food until the royal mandate was obeyed. Nigel at last unwillingly obeyed, but not until his uncle had endured three days' fast. The king on taking possession of the castle, appropriated to his own use a treasure of 40,000 marks, besides an immense quantity of plate and jewels, which he found there. A council was held at Winchester, to examine into this extraordinary affair, and others of a similar character, affecting the bishops and clergy, and there Bishop Roger made his last appearance in public life. Nothing could be done against the power of Stephen, who retained the possessions he had thus acquired. The unfortunate bishop, either through grief at his loss, or from the effect of his long fasting, was soon after seized with a quartan ague, of which he died."

The power of prejudice is strikingly displayed in the tone in which, after narrating all this, Mr. Foss speaks of "Becket." His biography of St. Thomas is marked with less than his usual accuracy, and is pregnant with inconsistency. Although he admits that "the sacred nature of his new office (of primate) would demand a stricter attention to external demeanour," he asserts that the king had reason to consider himself deceived when Becket, shortly after his nomination to the primacy, sent in his resignation of the Chancellorship, on the pretence of his incompetence to perform the duties of the two offices. "They could not (says Mr. Foss) be considered incompatible, several bishops having already held the great seal," a gross *non sequitur*. The author forgot what manner of men they were, and he also forgot that men of another character, such as Anselm, would not accept the office of Chancellor. Mr. Foss says that Henry had reason to complain, because he found in St. Thomas, not an assistant, but an antagonist; although it is allowed that he only attempted "the resumption of

some of the Church's *ancient rights,*" and it is admitted also "that Henry was *aiming at independence of papal authority,*" for which (adds the author) "the time was not yet ripe." But it *would* have been had it not been for St. Thomas, who, it is clear, was massacred because he would not consent to see the Church enslaved, and whose martyrdom postponed for some centuries the curse of schism which afterwards fell upon the land.

As one instance of the effect of prejudice in distorting the sense of truth, it is worth mentioning, that one of the strongest of the very few cases of inaccuracy on the part of Mr. Foss, occurs in his life of "Becket," when (p. 204) speaking of the king's claim that clerks should be subject to the jurisdiction of the crown, he says: "The sentence in the ecclesiastical courts was deprivation and loss of orders, operating of course, as *a very slight* restraint;" (although the loss of orders would expose the offender to the full penalty of the secular law on a second offence.) "The consequence was, that *murders* and other *atrocities*, by claimants of clerical exemption, were sadly numerous;" "and a *horrible case of the kind just then occurring*, Henry determined to bring the question to an issue." Now, this "horrible case of the kind," i. e. of "murder," or some similar "atrocity," was simply a case of *manslaughter*, according to the author's own account of it, (p. 242) in which the priest was condemned to make pecuniary compensation to the relatives of the deceased. And then the king's judge wanted afterwards to have him *retried!* Mr. Foss makes it matter of complaint that a priest should, for manslaughter, have been sentenced only to make pecuniary composition, evidently not aware that this was the *Saxon* law for all men, lay or clerical, and that it is lauded by Protestant historians as a humane substitute for sanguinary penalties, owing to the humanizing influences of the Church. He represents the "privilege of clergy" as extending only to the clergy, whereas, he knows that it extended to all who could *read*, and was a privilege not merely for the priesthood, but for literature, which existed almost to our own time. Until a comparatively recent period, the law of England privileged from the penalties of felony any person who could read, a privilege which had survived the "Reformation," and the existence of which, in the "dark ages," should scarcely have excited in the mind of a man like Mr. Foss,

so much of prejudice. If he will read the accounts of the contemporary chroniclers he will find that the object of the king was to establish tyranny over the people, and with that view to begin by enslaving the clergy. His pretence was their "improvement;" but if Mr. Foss had read the narrative of his atrocities, he would hardly have been so deluded as to give credit to it. It is equally unworthy of his learning to talk of the "*ancient* customs" of Clarendon, which he must know, had never been heard of before. In his notice of "John of Oxford," Dean of Salisbury, he mentions that he presided at the council of Clarendon, and was sent to the Pope to obtain his confirmation of the "customs." In this embassy, he adds, of course he failed; but in the following year he was again sent, with an associate, and on their way to Rome they attended a diet at Wurzburg, *which had been assembled for the acknowledgment of the anti-pope.* A very fit, and a very significant sequel, of such a mission.

In the reign of Henry III. we find "Peter de Rupibus," Bishop of Winchester, high in the favour of his sovereign, and leading him into evil measures, "until," says Mr. Foss, "the king's eyes were opened by Edmund, Archbishop of Canterbury, who caused the bishop to be sent back to his own diocese." This was St. Edmund, and it is to be noted, that we do not find his name enrolled any more than that of St. Anselm, in the list of Chancellors or Justiciaries. In the middle of the same (the thirteenth) century, we read of Walter Giffard, Archbishop of York, resigning the Great Seal soon after his elevation to that See; nor are there wanting other instances, recorded in this work, of prelates, not saintly, who acted in a similar way (as Walter de Merton, Bishop of Rochester). So that Mr. Foss was without excuse in reflecting upon St. Thomas for taking that view. The truth is, however, that it was all along the papal view; and it was always without the approbation of the Holy See that prelates, except when necessary, mixed themselves up with civil or political affairs, and the prelates who did so, were the least zealous for religion, and the least loyal to Rome.

Robert Burnel, Bishop of Wells, who was Chancellor for eighteen years under Edward I., and who was elected to the Primacy, but rejected by the Pope, "never," says Mr. Foss, "lost the confidence of his royal master," a

distinction "which he well merited, from the wisdom of his counsels, and the zeal and assiduity with which he aided his *sovereign's* efforts in the improvement of the law;" that "improvement" consisting in the commencement of that fatal system of anti-papal legislation, which resulted in schism. Lord Coke, the apologist of arbitrary power, points with pride and pleasure to this reign for that very reason, and tells with great exultation, the story of the man whom the king "would have hanged" for bringing in a papal bill against his will. The idea of preventing ecclesiastics from appealing to Rome had already been long entertained, and sometimes carried out by violence. Mr. Foss mentions some instances. John de Kirkely, Treasurer under Edward I., was another of these courtier prelates, and was made Bishop of Ely by royal influence in 1284. "He is charged," says Mr. Foss, "with neglecting the care of his diocese, in his devotion to the affairs of the state, and to have borne himself with too much arrogance, sinking the bishop in the treasurer." Walter de Langton, who succeeded Burnel as Keeper of the Seal, and was afterwards Treasurer, and *then* Bishop of Lichfield, no doubt by royal influence, for he retained office, with some interruptions, for twenty years, and, retiring in 1314, "spent the remainder of his days," says Mr. Foss, "in the quiet exercise of his episcopal authority," dying in 1321.

John de Langton, an ecclesiastic who succeeded Bishop Burnel as Chancellor, and with some intermissions held the office for eighteen years, was rejected by the Pope on his election to the See of Ely, though nine years afterwards, during an interval in which he had resigned the office, he was elevated to the See of Chichester. He finally resigned the Great Seal in 1310, and presided over his diocese during the latter part of the troubled reign of Edward II., and the first ten years of that of his successor, dying in 1337. "He was resolute," says Mr. Foss, "in the discharge of his ecclesiastical functions. Having excommunicated Earl Warren, for adultery, that nobleman came with his retainers, to lay violent hands on him, but the bishop, aided by his servants, succeeded in resisting their attempt, and threw the earl and all his party into prison." An incident highly illustrative of the character of the times.

"During the reign of Edward III.," says Mr. Foss,

"twelve of the seventeen chancellors were ecclesiastics, four being, or becoming archbishops, and eight bishops; the others, the laymen, were forced upon the king by the parliament, but he on each occasion took the earliest opportunity of restoring the Great Seal to clerical hands," which shows that ecclesiastics made the best chancellors. But it is clear that chancellors did not make the best bishops. And of this the ecclesiastics were quite aware, and if at all conscientious, showed a disposition to resign their civil offices on their elevation to the episcopate, or at all events, the primacy. Thus, in this reign, John de Stratford, Bishop of Winchester, resigned the Great Seal in the very year in which he was raised to the Archbishopric of Canterbury. And although he was twice afterwards induced to assume the office, he only retained it on the first occasion for two years, and on the second only for *two months.* Of this prelate, Mr. Foss, in his biography of him records, that he was nominated by the Pope, "notwithstanding the urgent application of the king (Edward II.) in favour of another," at which "the king's anger was excessive. He remonstrated with the Pope, issued directions to the bailiffs of the different ports, to arrest any messengers coming into England with letters on the subject, and expressed the bitterest rancour against the new made prelate, calling him in one of his missives, 'pseudo nuntium,' and 'adversarium nostrum,' and dismissing him from his ambassadorial functions in terms of indignation. On his arrival in England proceedings were immediately commenced against him in the Court of King's Bench, which were removed to the parliament, in which he was addressed merely by his name, without the episcopal title, an omission, which he, by his answers, was most careful always to supply. No further record of the process appears, but by the intercession of the Pope, Stratford was at last reluctantly recognized, and his temporalities restored in 1324."

It is worth while noticing the difference between Pope's bishops, and king's bishops. Thus of Simon of Sudbury, the Archbishop of Canterbury, who was murdered by the mob, under Richard II., and who was made Bishop of London by the favour of the Pope, Mr. Foss says, "the character of the archbishop, as represented by the historians, was such as to make him least liable to popular hatred. He was of a liberal, free, and generous spirit;

admired for his wonderful parts, for his wisdom, his learning, and his eloquence, and revered for the piety of his life, the charity he dispensed, and the merciful consideration he universally exhibited." He fell a sacrifice to the sins of others, with whom, as Chancellor, he was unfortunately associated in the responsibility of government. It was in this reign that the Pope endeavoured to withdraw prelates from the administration of civil affairs, and his endeavour to do so, by translation, was made the pretext for the last of that series of statutes directed against the papal power, which reduced it at length, as Mr. Froude truly says, to a mere *sham*. Archbishop Courteneye, who succeeded Sudbury in the Chancellorship, only retained it three months, which Mr. Foss finds it "difficult to account for," but is very probably explained by the fact that Courteneye, who was elected to the Episcopate by "papal provision," entertained papal ideas as to the proper vocation of the Episcopate.

It is to be observed that this excellent prelate, who, for fifteen years held the Primacy after he had resigned the Chancellorship, was the prelate whose character was so reverenced by the people, that they very roughly treated John of Gaunt, for offering him insult on the occasion of the prosecution of Wicliffe. It is also to be observed that the Archbishop, as Mr. Foss states, during the fifteen years for which he held the Primacy, was engaged in various contests with his bishops, as to the right of visitation, "in all of which he was triumphant," a fact which speaks volumes as to the character of the Episcopate at that period; courtly to the *temporal* power, insubordinate to their spiritual superiors, whether Primate or Pope. Mr. Foss notices that John de Waltham, Bishop of Salisbury, was one of the prelates who resisted the Archbishop's right of visitation, and he was only "frightened into submission, for within two days after sentence of excommunication had been pronounced against him, he underwent the visitation." Of this prelate it is also stated that he was, both before and after his elevation to the episcopate, constantly engaged in secular affairs and civil offices, and that he "was regarded with the highest favour by his sovereign," the weak and wretched Richard II., whose favour did not reflect much credit on its object, and whose fate betrayed the absence of wisdom in his counsels.

Another prelate, who equally enjoyed the favour of the

Pope, was the illustrious William of Wykeham, for whom the people had such a veneration that, when he was oppressed by John of Gaunt, they rose in his defence, and compelled him to do the great prelate justice. It is mentioned by Mr. Foss, that this illustrious man "was *compelled* by the king, much against his inclination, to accept the office of Chancellor." This was for the second time. He held the Great Seal on this occasion for only two years and a half. "During that period," says Mr. Foss,* "he had the happiness to restore the public tranquillity so effectually, that parliament thanked the king for his good government; and could he have been induced to remain in office, it is probable that his wise counsels might have checked the king's intemperance, and prevented the fatal consequences that followed." He finally gave up the Seal in September, 1391; and in September 1399, exactly eight years afterwards, the foolish monarch, who declared that he held the "regalty" independent of any control of Christ's vicar, resigned his throne to an usurper, and speedily perished in prison. During the interval the Seal had been held for five years by Arundel, who had previously held it again and again, and was one of the most political of prelates. He was a partizan of Henry IV., when exiled, joining him in his invasion of England, and deposition of his sovereign. "He enjoyed Henry's favour during the whole of his reign," and again and again held the Chancellorship under him, so that he held it altogether nearly twelve years. This was the prelate, during whose primacy death was first inflicted for heresy. Mr. Foss mentions that this was by a statute passed in this reign, and observes, "probably the archbishop was *no more* guilty than the rest of his brethren of obtaining this detestable act;" as if they had "obtained" it at all, its purview being purely *political*, as its antecedents and its own history and recitals amply demonstrate. Mr. Foss himself mentions in his biography of Courteneye that the opinions of Wickliffe had been encouraged by the crown and the nobility, John of Gaunt taking the heretic under his open protection. It was not until his followers began to preach against *property*, and cause rebellion, that the aristocracy took the alarm, and passed a statute to sup-

* Foss, iv. 149.

press them. To talk of the *prelates* as having obtained it is really idle; they were *powerless* in parliament, unable to procure the repeal of the statutes of *præmunire*, or provisors, or to prevent an address to the crown *at this very time*, for the confiscation of Church property. This fact is mentioned by Mr. Foss in the very next paragraph (iv. 148) to that in which he represents the bishops as "obtaining" a statute for the burning of heretics! The Lollards were *not* mere heretics, nor was the statute passed against them as such, nor observed by the bishops at all. It was directed against them as disturbers of the peace, and was passed from political motives, and by the influence of an alarmed and an anti-papal aristocracy, and not of the episcopate. And if Arundel concurred in it, it was as one of the most political of prelates, and as the favoured minister of the crown, and not at all in his episcopal character, or in conformity with the spirit of the Church. That was an age in which papal authority had almost utterly vanished. The sad schism in the papacy had reduced it to the lowest state of depression. And just after its close, when the new Pope made Beaufort apostolic legate, Chichely, the Archbishop of Canterbury, who deemed this an encroachment on his authority, induced the king to forbid the cardinal from accepting the dignity:—precisely the same feeling which was shown by Warham towards Wolsey after the lapse of another century.

Mr. Foss does justice to the magnificent character of Beaufort, his biography of whom is one of the most admirable in his work. Extremely interesting, also, is his account of William of Waynflete, whose merits were first discerned and drawn forth by the great Cardinal. Still Beaufort was not, until the close of his life, devoted to his episcopal duties; and Mr. Foss significantly states that the king promoted his election to the bishopric.

So of Bourchier, whose "relationship to the royal family procured him the valuable preferment of St. Martin's, London." And in the same year, his "neighness of blood," as well as the desire of the commons and parliament, was urged by the king to the prior and convent of Worcester, as a recommendation for his election to fill the vacancy in that See. The Pope, however, appointed another, and it was not without a threat to the latter, if he accepted the nomination, and an urgent appli-

cation to the former, that the king succeeded in placing Bourchier there. Nearly eighteen months were occupied in the negotiations, and even then his consecration had to be delayed for a month, on account of his not being of sufficient age." "The monkish historians give him a very unfavourable character, stating that during his ten years' rule, he never performed mass in the Church but once,—on the day of his installation, and that he warily oppressed the prior, and other of the brothers, by fines, and the tenants by imprisonment." Exactly what might be expected of a prelate who owed his elevation, not to papal favour, but to royal will, not to holiness of character, but to "neighness of blood." "The council, at the request of the commons, for his grete merets, virtues, and *grete* blood, that he is of" joined in "recommending Bishop Bourchier to the Pope, for the Primacy," to which he was elected by royal influence in 1454.

Ten years afterwards, no doubt from similar influences, he was created Cardinal; but it is observable that he did not receive the hat till nearly ten years more. Still, ten years more his long life was preserved, during which he had exhibited all the pliancy of a courtier, and had crowned three usurpers in succession, and he lived to crown Henry VII.

This brings us to the age of Morton and of More, and to Mr. Foss's fifth volume, of which their biographies form, with that of Wolsey, the chief features.

"Commencing his public career as an advocate in the Court of Arches, he soon attracted the notice of Archbishop Bourchier, to whose friendship and estimation of his talents he owed several of his advancements in the Church and state.....In 1479 he was made Bishop of Ely, and during the remaining four years of Edward's reign he quietly performed his episcopal duties.....He assisted Henry VII. in his invasion of England, and was made Chancellor in 1486, and on the death of Cardinal Bourchier in the same year, was raised to the primacy.

"Thus placed in possession of the highest offices both in Church and state, he retained them during the remainder of his life, that is, until 1500.

"As a minister of the former, one of his first efforts was directed to the reformation of the priests.

"So early as the March succeeding his election, the Archbishop addressed a rebuking letter to the clergy, forbidding their appearance in taverns, reprobating their non-residence on their benefices, &c. His strenuous exertions in pursuing his ecclesiastical reforms

naturally produced hostility on the part of those attacked, and were even opposed by some of the bishops. His energy, however, was supported by the king and approved by the Pope, who rewarded him with the cardinal's hat." (Foss v. 65, 66.)

Sir T. More was brought up in Cardinal Morton's house, and was his great favourite. In his *Utopia* there are sentiments ascribed to the Cardinal of a tone very similar to that which pervades the entire work, a tone of cold and sneering disrespect towards the Holy See, which at that time unhappily prevailed even among the best of men, and the prevalence of which marked an utter decline of Papal authority, the real cause of the schism about so speedily to ensue. It is impossible not to see that More had imbibed these ideas from the Cardinal's conversation, as Morton had doubtless acquired them in the household of Bourchier, the contemporary with that schism in the Papacy which so weakened its authority. Mr. Foss observed that it seems surprising that the *Utopia* should have escaped the attention of the government. But it was published in 1516, when More was in high favour with the king, and about to supplant Wolsey, and when the king was already contemplating that course of sacrilege and spoliation which he afterwards pursued. Mr. Froude, in his *History*, gives us an insight into the state of Henry's mind at that time, amply accounting for his non-interference with the *Utopia*.

It is a curious instance of the force of traditional prejudice that More's character is always painted as unselfish and heroic, and Wolsey's as scheming and ambitious. But More's signature was affixed to the atrocious list of charges against the Cardinal, charges so atrocious as to be reckoned as infamous and absurd even by Protestant historians. And having supplanted Wolsey, although the king's designs must have been well known, More continued for three years, as Chancellor, to countenance Henry's tyranny, and held the great seal at the time of Wolsey's final seizure and disgrace.

Mr. Foss is blind to all this, and in his biography of Fitz James, one of the judges, finds fault with Lord Campbell for condemning him as "the adviser and dictator of the articles adopted against Wolsey." "The signature," (says Mr. Foss) "is merely a formal one, and the articles no more indicate a pre-existing envy and jealousy

in Fitz James than they do in Sir Thomas More, who signed at the head of all." *No more*, certainly. But for once we think Lord Campbell right, in considering that the signing those atrocious articles indicated "pre-existing feelings of envy and jealousy," or other feelings of the meanest and most malignant nature; and it has always destroyed in our minds the belief in the *heroism* of More. No doubt he had that tenacious firmness which Englishmen so much admire; but courage does not by itself constitute heroism, although it is always an attribute of it. There can never be heroism with feelings so mean as those of envy and jealousy. Moreover, Wolsey had been the patron and the friend of More, who repaid him first by supplanting and then by co-operating in his ruin.

Mr. Foss speaks, in terms which do honour to his moral feelings, of More's infamous successor, Audley.

"Audley had the custody of the seal for nearly twelve years, a period more disgraceful in the annals of England than any of a similar extent. Within it were comprehended the king's divorce from one queen, after an union of two-and-twenty years, under pretence of a scruple of conscience; the repudiation of another, after a few days intercourse, on the mere ground of personal antipathy; the execution of two others, one of them sacrificed to obtain a new partner, and innumerable judicial and remorseless murders, those of Sir T. More and Bishop Fisher leading the dreadful array. Even the Reformation, the foundations of which were laid during this period, though producing such glorious results to this country, (?) brings nothing but disgrace on its active originators. Commenced by a despotic tyrant, in defiance of the religious tenets which he had himself advocated, and which he still professed, the *power of the Pope was abjured solely in revenge for the papal refusal to sanction his divorce*; his own imposed supremacy was only used to introduce doctrines which it was equally difficult for Catholics or Protestants to adopt, each suffering in turn from the dilemma in which they were placed; and the monasteries were dissolved not for the professed purposes of pacification, but for the sake of the riches they produced to the king's treasury, and to supply the means of rewarding the subservient minions of his power."

How refreshing is this truth-telling frankness of Mr. Foss, compared with the miserable sophistry of Mr. Froude, who has attempted in his *History* to gild these black transactions with the aid of a spurious morality!

"Among those who thus profited by the spoliations, Audley, who all along acted as a thorough tool to the king, and was a most

zealous promoter of the suppression, secured no inconsiderable share of the confiscations, carving for himself, in the feast of abbey lands, as Fuller humorously remarks, the first cut, and that a dainty morsel. This was the magnificent priory of the Holy Trinity or Christ Church, in Aldgate, London, founded in the reign of Henry I., which, having been surrendered by the prior, was granted to the Chancellor within a year after he attained that dignity. He pulled down the great Church, and converted the priory into a mansion for himself, in which he resided during the remainder of his life. It was subsequently called Duke's Palace, from his son-in-law, the Duke of Norfolk. To this were next added many of the smaller priories. But he was not satisfied, and fixed his eye on the great monastery of Walden. He succeeded in his application, (for a grant) and took his title from the plunder."*

"His interpretations of the law on the various criminal trials at which he presided, are a disgrace not only to him, but to every member of the bench associated with him; while both branches of the legislature are equally chargeable with the ignominy of passing the acts he introduced, perilling every man's life by the new treasons they invented, and every man's conscience by the contradictory oaths they imposed. It is a degradation to the pious and excellent Sir Thomas More, to mention him even in contrast with such a man as Audley; and the name of More's less amiable predecessor Wolsey, acquires an added brightness when the moderation of his ministry, during the earlier years of the reign, is compared with the persecuting spirit which prevailed, while Audley held the seals."

Nothing is more undeniable or worthy of note than this, that persecution in every age has taken its rise among those who were subservient to royal power. It was creatures like Audley and Wriothesley who were most ready to be the instruments of a tyrant's will; and Cranmer, who set to Gardiner and Bonner the evil example of inflicting death for heresy, was associated with them in the denial of the papal supremacy, and the promotion of the royal adultery and royal tyranny.

Among those who concurred with More in the disgrace of Wolsey, was Gardiner, who pandered so shamefully to the tyranny of Henry. "Throughout the remainder of Henry's reign, Gardiner devoted himself to the king's service, and until towards its close, succeeded in preserv-

---

* A title perpetuated in the peerage of Howard de Walden, as many other titles of our present peerage perpetuate the memory of the sacrilegious spoliations on which they were founded.

ing his ascendancy in the royal councils. This he effected by accommodating himself to Henry's humours, whatever they might be. After concluding his efforts to release the king from his first wife, which he did by sitting in the court with Archbishop Cranmer, when the marriage was pronounced null and void, he went as ambassador to France." Bonner was joined in the embassy, and these two men who were thus the willing instruments with Cranmer, of royal tyranny, afterwards were not ashamed to burn him for heresy; a fate which he no doubt had deserved in exactly the same way, by burning others for it, and pandering to the same system of tyranny. The source of all heresy was the royal supremacy, to which Gardiner, with the entire episcopate, had apostatized. "Like all his brethren of the episcopal bench, he was compelled to swear to the king's supremacy; this he not only appeared to do with the greatest readiness, but wrote strongly and ably in its support." And at the same time he was the most eager in invoking its power against those who erred from the faith, the very basis of which he had forsaken, and he procured, or promoted, the bloody "six articles." So it has ever been; persecution has always been promoted by men of regal principles. Thus Rich, the wretched creature who (infamous as Audley) betrayed More and Fisher, and was chancellor under Edward VI., "by a timely desertion of his party," says Mr. Foss, "escaped the immediate consequences of his support of Lady Jane Grey, and he probably obtained favour with Queen Mary by his profession of the Roman Catholic faith. In a month after she was proclaimed, he was nominated one of the council, &c., and his name was frequently placed at the head of the commissions in his county, for trying heretics, at the cruel execution of some of whom he was directed to be present." And then, under Elizabeth, he became a Protestant again, and joined in proscribing Papists. These were the persecutors under Mary.

In some articles in the *Tablet*, upon Hallam's History, we observed that it was stated that the persecutors were concealed Protestants, (i.e. servile supporters of the new system of which the essence was the royal supremacy), and that they were actuated by the design to render the Catholic Church odious to the nation, and thus enable themselves to retain the lands of which they had sacrile-

giously robbed her. This view was supported by citations from that historian, and was upheld some years ago in the *Rambler*. It is, as we have just seen, substantiated by the testimony of Mr. Foss; and yet we were surprised to see a letter from Canon Flanagan, in the *Tablet*, not distinctly denying, but depreciating as extreme, and indirectly casting discredit on a view thus upheld by Protestant authorities. It is an undoubted historical fact that many of those who were the covert promoters of persecution under Mary, were equally active under Edward and Elizabeth, and were gorged with Church plunder.

So of Paulet, Marquis of Winchester, who was treasurer under Henry, and Lord Keeper under Edward, and who boasted that he was a *willow* and not an oak: his history amply illustrates this anecdote. He was one of those who undertook to support the succession of the kingdom on Lady Jane Grey, and presented the crown to her; but he had the art, says Mr. Foss, very soon to see his dangerous position, and contrived to be one of those who met to cause Mary to be proclaimed. This secured to him a continuance in his office of Treasurer for the whole of that reign, during which he is said to have "*been active in the persecutions which disgraced it.*" His patent, however, was *renewed when Elizabeth succeeded!* The willow, again, managed to bend to the storm.

So of Sir Roger Cholmley, Chief Justice of the King's Bench under Edward; he had been one of the "commissioners" selected to harass and rob poor Wolsey; he was also a commissioner under Henry, to enquire into offences against the bloody "six articles." He had conspired under Edward to supplant Mary; yet contrived to acquire her favour and retain his office, and sat on the trials of some of the prisoners, his old associates, towards whom he behaved with the greatest atrocity. Nor is this all; "Queen Mary," says Mr. Foss, "admitted him to her council," and it appears that he was, on several occasions, "appointed to examine prisoners in the Tower, with torture. Under Elizabeth he was a Protestant.

So of Wriothesley, one of Henry's minions, of whom Mr. Foss says, that "though devoted to the Romish religion," *he showed no scruples in sharing the plunder arising from its destruction*, and eagerly enriched himself with grants from the King; and whom our author describes "as one who was haughty towards his inferiors,

and lavishly subservient to those who were above him." He succeeded the infamous Audley as Chancellor, and proved himself a fit successor. "The King having publicly exhibited his own sentiments, by passing the Act of the Six Articles, Wriothesley, always a secret supporter of those extreme doctrines, now *pursued to extremity those who impugned them;*" and he is accused, in connection with Anne Askewe, of having himself applied the torture when the common executioners appeared to compassionate the sufferer." Yet this wretch was one of Edward's council.

Another of Henry's minions was Nicholas Bacon (the father of Sir Francis) who had a grant from him of three manors which had belonged to the Monastery of St. Edmondsbury; and, "during Edward's reign, purchased the estate of Gorham, which had belonged to St. Alban's Abbey." "The accession of Queen Mary made no change in his official position, from which, notwithstanding the bigoted frenzy of the times, he was never removed during the whole of her reign, so great was the prudence which he manifested in the avoidance of dangerous topics;" such, for instance, as the sanctity of Church property. Prudence would indeed dictate to a plunderer, the policy of *silence,* under a sovereign who had scruples upon that delicate subject. We can imagine with what insincerity the pretended reconciliation of England to the Holy See, under the rule of men like him, must have been conducted, and how anxiously such as he must have looked for a sound Protestant successor who should "make their titles sure." And when Mr. Foss says, with some simplicity, "that he was known to be strongly affected to the reformed doctrines, *cannot be doubted,* from Queen Elizabeth's immediate selection of him as her principal legal minister," we are unavoidably amused; and the suspicion is irresistibly provoked, that the feature of the "reformed doctrines" to which Sir Nicholas was most "strongly affected," was their recognition of the royal right to plunder the Church, and the legal title of those who had divided the spoil. At all events he was Chancellor for twenty years under Elizabeth. So Anthony Brown, Chief Justice under Mary, was active in sending prisoners to Bonner to be tried for heresy, and yet he accepted office under Elizabeth. So of many others.

The sixth volume of the work of Mr. Foss, which comprises the Biographies of the Chancellors and Judges under Elizabeth, James, and Charles I., is less interesting than the former volumes, for even the Chancellors were no longer men of the *calibre* of those illustrious ecclesiastics who, in former times, had ruled England in Church and State, and were miserable characters in comparison with Wolsey, with Bourchier, or Morton. The history becomes a simple record of selfish struggles for place and pelf; and even the mighty intellect of Bacon yielded to the low spirit of the age. The volume opens with the wretched enmities and jealousies of Bacon and of Coke; and the respectable mediocrity of Ellesmere, and of Coventry. It is remarkable that the most able man of the age was Archbishop Williams, the only ecclesiastic who held the Seals after the Reformation. They who fancy that ecclesiastics are unfit to rule, might learn a lesson from this valuable work, but that is the least of the lessons which may be gathered from it. It shows, in the most striking manner, how the greatness of England was founded upon her ancient religion; how she lost her freedom as she lost her faith, and how heresy led to tyranny.

ART. II.—*Six Months in Italy.* By George Stillman Hillard, 2 vols. London: Murray, 1853.

WE never heard of Mr. Hillard before, and know nothing more of him now than what is disclosed in these two volumes. There is internal evidence that, though a lawyer, a Protestant, and a Yankee, he is also a scholar and a gentleman, neither conceited nor opinionated; and though believing his own country and his own religion to be the best, yet not insensible to the beauty and the excellence of other countries, and another form of belief; and not stupidly bent upon curing the maladies of all the social communities in the world, by forcing down the unwilling throats of every one of them, his own political

institutions. Taking up the book casually, it fixed our attention at once, and it is long since we have read a volume of Travels with so much pleasure. Of course we are far from agreeing in all that he says; and there are, in some of his observations, strong characteristic marks of the bias his mind has received from both his country and his creed. He seems to gauge success and happiness by a measure which is applicable only to *this life;* and does not appear always sufficiently to remember that the whole object of life here is to prepare ourselves for another and more durable state of existence; and that the only true test therefore, of the success or happiness of this life is, what sort of preparation it forms for entrance into the next. Tried by this test, it may even be the fact that an Italian beggar has better corresponded with the purpose of his Creator than the most successful merchant, or most applauded statesman. Of course, it *may be* just otherwise; the beggar may be a knave, and the merchant or statesman, a man of most sincere rectitude; all that we mean is that, in judging of the happiness or success, whether of individuals or of nations, it is a delusion to consider this life as any other than a state of preparation for another; and manners and customs, facts and results, and all the occurrences of life, should be judged by this test, how they tend to form a preparation for Eternity. We advert to this test because it seems too often to be *taken for granted* that the set of men, who have got on the best in this world, are on that account alone, and of course, patterns for imitation; and that the poor nun, or poor monk, or it may be the poor man at large in the world, who has passed a sinless but, as is alleged, a useless life, has ill fulfilled the great objects of our Creator. Of course we would be careful not to go into the other extreme; there are different temperaments and different kinds of excellence; let all of them however, be judged with reference to that preparatory state of existence here to which we have alluded.

After giving a favourable account of a convent he visited, our author remarks: "There must be some chord in the heart of man that responds to such a life. Everyone has moments of weariness or disgust, in which he longs for profound retirement and entire repose; and then there glides before his eyes the vision of a monastery, with books to read, a garden to till, a grand prospect to look at, and

a few congenial friends to talk with." How utterly *confined to this life* are these ideas! It does not seem to enter into his contemplation that a man, either without or with a knowledge of the world, may prefer the cloister simply as the better road to heaven.

Our author has an eye for both the beautiful and the ridiculous; his criticisms on pictures and statuary occupy, perhaps, too large a space to be acceptable to the ordinary reader, though they seem to be dictated by both good taste and good sense. We have, however, marked several passages for quotation, and must hurry to them; having selected such as may lead the reader to turn to the volumes themselves. He thus closes his remarks on Venice:

"All this is but little in the telling. Bright lights, an ice, and indifferent music, seem hardly worth going to Venice for. What a waste of time! says the moralist. What an unprofitable evening! says the schoolmaster. Certainly, not profitable, taking life through, but a week of such evenings leaves very pleasant recollections behind. It was agreeable to one coming from our restless country to breathe for awhile the soothing atmosphere of repose, to see men sitting quietly in their chairs, and evidently not struggling against an impulse to whittle at the arms by way of safety-valve to their nervous unrest. And then, too, it was refreshment to see so many happy faces. Content, when it is the result of discipline and struggle, is a great virtue; when it is the natural birth of a tranquil mind and a healthy body, it is a great blessing; in any event, the picture it paints upon the countenance is always exhilarating; and St. Mark's place, on a fine evening, is a gallery of such pictures."

After visiting the Armenian convent in Venice, he writes:

"The most intolerant enemy of monastic institutions must feel his rigour relent in the presence of these excellent Armenian monks, whose lives are most industrious and most useful. They are instructors of youth, and printers of books, in the Armenian language, and their convent is both a school and a printing-office. They were striking off, at the time of my visit, an edition of the Penny Magazine. It was curious to see the familiar plates of that work in company with so unfamiliar a text. I believe this is the only Armenian press now at work in the world, and its publications circulate all over the East. I could not look without veneration upon the spot to which all the people of one language turn for intellectual light, nor without respect upon the self-sacrificing men who, without hope

of fame or wealth, are toiling patiently for the diffusion of knowledge among their scattered brethren."

Here is a criticism on veils and bonnets, for the edification of our lady readers, who we are bound to admit have already almost discarded the bonnet, and perhaps may, on the recommendation of our author, be induced—to take the veil.

"I was in Verona on Sunday. The weather was fine, and the streets were filled with well-dressed persons of both sexes. Of the women, the majority wore veils, but a portion, apparently the higher classes, were in bonnets. In the comparison, the former had greatly the advantage. A veil seems the natural covering of the female head, because in its flow and folds it resembles the waiving and floating of the hair, and it crowns and shades the face in the same manner. Its lines blend with the rest of the dress gracefully, and without abrupt transitions; and it can be so disposed as to suit every style of face and head. We are accustomed to bonnets, and do not recognize their essential ugliness, just as men, a hundred years ago, found beauty and becomingness in the powder, pomatum, wire, and crape, with which the hair was tortured and deformed; but no one whose eye has rested for any time upon the beautiful head-dresses so common in Italy, will ever be reconciled to the bold staring front, and incongruous ornaments of a bonnet. A veil is not only a beautiful piece of dress, but it is the most impressive and symbolical of all forms of costume. It is the representative of purity, gentleness, and modesty. It is hallowed by a thousand associations and traditions, and graced by a thousand poetical fancies. Its folds come floating to us from the distant East, and the dim past. Art, in all its forms, welcomes and adopts it; but, before a bonnet, the poet drops his pen, the sculptor his chisel, and the painter his brush."

There is much shrewd and not very inaccurate observation in the sketch of the company in the Cascine at Florence.

"Here, in the afternoon, assemble all the gay world of Florence, native and foreign, some in carriages, some on horseback, and some on foot. Here may be seen the equipages and the manners of all Europe. An Italian prince drives four showy horses, for his own amusement, and their exercise, in a sort of drag, looking like an omnibus, with the body taken off. Russia and France are also represented; but, as is the case all over the Continent, the largest portion comes from England,—that country which is loved by its people with such pugnacious patriotism, while they are running away from its taxes, its dull climate, its sea-coal fires, and the grim exclusiveness of its society. Perhaps three quarters of the

carriages are unmistakeably English. They are known to be such by their air of finish and good taste, the excellent condition and sleek coats of the horses, the completeness of the harness and appointments, the modest reserve of the colours, the well-fed respectability of the coachman, and the overdressed women and haughty countenances inside."

Our author, accustomed to the advertizing and platform system of charity, is much struck with the opposite or *incognito* system so prevalent in Italy, and which has also the advantage of being recommended by our Saviour.

"The stranger in Florence will soon encounter, in the course of his walks about the city, an uncouth figure, enveloped in a black robe, the face and head covered with a hood, in which are glass spaces for the eyes. He goes about soliciting alms, never speaking, but inciting attention by rattling the box which he carries. The disguise is so perfect that a man would not detect his father under it. This person, who may be the wealthiest nobleman in Florence, perhaps the Grand Duke himself, is a member of the Brotherhood of Mercy, engaged in collecting charity voluntarily, or imposed as a penance by his father confessor. This institution, which had its origin in the 13th century, and was then substantially what it is now, is one of the forms in which the spirit of religion mitigated the rigour of feudal distinctions, and enforced the perfect equality of all men before God. It is an association composed, mainly, of the wealthy and prosperous classes, whose duty it is to nurse the sick, to aid those who have been injured by accident, and to secure decent burial to the poor and the friendless. They are summoned by the sound of a bell, and when its warning voice is heard, the gay guest glides from the ball-room, or dinner-party, slips on his black robe, and aids, perhaps, in carrying to the hospital some poor labourer, who has broken his leg by a fall from a scaffold, and waits to assist the surgeon and nurses in their care of the patient. Such institutions, worthy of praise and imitation at all times, were invaluable at the period when they were founded; and they are always to be remembered to the credit of the Romish Church, which so carefully guarded the principle of humanity against the encroachments of caste during the Middle Ages, and thus helped to prevent the sparks of freedom from being trampled out by the iron heel of nobility."

In spite of the early puritanical training and sectarian habits of thought which our author acknowledges, the influence of all that meets the senses in Catholic religious worship, affects him in a way to show how wonderfully it is adapted to the various tendencies and qualities of human nature. *He* saw much to move *him*, and he might have

reflected that what even offended *his* taste, might be conformable to the tastes of more humble, or less critical, human beings, whilst they would not appreciate all that pleased him; that religion, true religion, should be calculated to reach, influence, and save *all;* and that in the eye of God the soul of the labourer is as valuable as that of the philosopher or the poet.

"Nor can even a Protestant and a layman be insensible to the spirit which hangs over them all, (the Churches of Rome,) and is felt by every one who crosses the threshold of the humblest and plainest, unless he be the lightest of scoffers or the sourest of Puritans. They are open at all times, spreading out their benignant arms of invitation, and in the spirit of the Saviour, bidding all who are weary and heavy laden to come to them and seek rest. No surly official stands at the entrance to scowl away the poor Christian that does not wear the wedding garment of respectability. The interior is not cut up into pews, protected by doors that are slow to open, and often guarded by countenances that are slow to expand into a look of invitation. The deep stillness, felt like a palpable presence, falls with a hushing power upon worldly emotions, and permits whispers, unheard in the roar of life, to become audible. The few persons who are present are either kneeling in silence or moving about with noiseless steps. In the windless air the very flames of the tapers do not tremble, but burn like painted flames upon painted candles. If there be a touch of worldly thrift in a picture covered by a curtain, which will not be withdrawn except on payment of a fee; if tawdry ornaments offend the taste, or even the sense of propriety; if tinsel spangles, and artificial flowers sometimes recall a milliner's shop rather than a church, who will not consent, in the spirit of candour, which is the spirit of wisdom, to overlook these discordant appendages, and say, 'What is the chaff to the wheat?' Of those who have spent any considerable time in Rome, at least of those who have lived long enough to feel the dangers and duties of life, there are few, I think, who will not be disposed to thank the churches of Rome for something more than mere gratifications of the taste; for influences, transitory perhaps, but beneficent while they last; for momentary glimpses of things spiritually discerned, for a presence that calms and a power that elevates. Protestant ideas and convictions are, in my opinion, not weakened by a residence in Rome; but Protestants, aiming at the reverse of wrong, have not always hit upon the right. The Romish Church, especially, is wiser in providing so much more liberally for that instinct of worship which is a deep thirst of the human soul. I envy not the head or the heart of that man who, when he sees the pavement of a Catholic Church sprinkled with kneeling forms and faces rapt with devotional fervour, is conscious of no other emotion

than a sneering protest against the mummeries of superstition. We walk in darkness, among pitfalls and snares, and the riddle of the life that is around us can only be solved by looking above us. If the swinging of a censer and the tinkling of a bell can help men to lift their thoughts from the dust of earthly passions, let us accept their aid, and let the end consecrate the means."

How much of both truth and feeling there is in the following remark.

"Surely if we (Americans) could bring home but one thing from Europe, that one thing should be a cathedral. In their majestic presence the natural language of the heart becomes thanksgiving and aspiration."

The following remarks not only suggest the national, social, and temporal advantages of the Catholic religious system, but they might also have suggested to the writer whether such a system "so admirably devised," and, amid all the changes and dissolutions of this changeable and perishing world, so unchanged and enduring, *could* have been indebted for its origin to mere human wisdom, or for its preservation to mere human protection.

"Viewing the Romish Church as an instrument, or an assemblage of instruments, to accomplish certain ends, without reference to the nature of those ends, or to the effect produced upon the individual instruments themselves, it may be pronounced the most perfect institution the world has ever known. Nothing was ever so admirably devised to cause the energies of its members to work together to accomplish a great object. The citizen, in Sparta, was not so much absorbed by the state as the individual, be he priest, bishop, or cardinal, is by the Church. The Church is the stream, and the individual members but drops that swell its tide and increase its current. No one can deny that there is something grand, as well as terrible, in this universal self-annihilation; and the commanding position of the Romish Church at this moment is a proof of the prodigious power which it gives. To produce this result—to secure to the Church the individual energies of its children—the celibacy of the clergy was an essential precedent. It was only by annihilating the natural ambition of founding a family that the Church could monopolize all those impulses and affections which in ordinary cases flow out upon a man's children, and flow no further. And this great distinction between the Catholic and the Protestant clergy is shown in the different ways in which the wealth drawn by both from the revenues of the Church is expended. The great ambition of an English bishop, commonly springing from the middle classes, and whose descendants will return to them, is to

lay up money for his children, and bequeath them wealth if not rank. Thus he lives far within his means, eats the bread of carefulness, and gives nothing to luxury or splendour; and the records of Doctors' Commons show that there is no class of persons who leave fortunes so large, in proportion to their incomes, and the time they have enjoyed them, as bishops. On the other hand, a Roman prelate, having no sons to establish in life, and no daughters to portion, seeks to link his fleeting existence with the enduring creations of genius. He builds a chapel, and adorns it with gems and marble; he repairs a church, he orders pictures and statues, and bestows them upon the public. If he be a cardinal, and very rich, his ambition soars higher. He founds a palace or a villa; fills it with works of art and precious remains of antiquity; designing it to be not only his abode while living, but his monument when dead. Thus, without the celibacy of the Roman clergy, we could not have had the palaces and villas of Rome and its vicinity, for most of them were built by cardinals or popes, and from the revenues of the Church. They form marked points of interest and attraction, and are among the peculiar and characteristic features of the Eternal City."

Protestants could not be practically paying a greater compliment to themselves than by showing themselves more frequently capable of travelling in Catholic countries and amongst Catholic people with such a reasonable, natural, and healthy appreciation of what is good and commendable, as is ordinarily manifested by our author.*

His remarks on the cultivation of the Roman Campagna, appear to us to be very interesting, and furnish the key to its peculiar condition. If his explanations may be relied upon, the present bare and houseless aspect of the Campagna does not arise from the neglect of its proprietors, and still less from the neglect of the Papal government. It is without population and with little tillage from the cause which has rased the cottages in many a highland glen, and made sheep-walks and deer-forests of what were once moorland farms and homesteads; that cause being the desire to obtain the largest possible return for the capital employed. We are, like him, not advocating a theory, but stating a fact. He explains that the Campagna, near Rome, is held in very large farms, or rather

* Since this article was in type, our cotemporary, the Quarterly Review, has published an indignant but most unworthy protest against the views of our author, in the form of a most calumnious attack on our Holy Religion.

districts, each being a great mercantile speculation, and the mercantile principle which determines the mode of cultivation, being, whether tillage or pasturage will yield the largest return on the capital employed. Whether rightly or wrongly, they, he says, have carefully calculated and deliberately maintain that they realize a higher percentage of profit on the capital they employ, by keeping the territory in pasture, than they could hope for by dividing it into fields, sowing it with grain crops, and building upon it cottages for the greater number of labourers who would then be employed. So strong is the feeling of self-interest in the large merchant farmers of the Campagna, that all the efforts of the Papal government to induce a mode of cultivation which would grow more human food, employ more human hands, and create more human habitations on that tract of land, have hitherto proved ineffectual. He says, that if you can prove to the Roman proprietor or farmer that he can make one per cent more upon his capital by raising corn rather than cattle, he will at once embark in the more profitable speculation. If this be the fact, it is well that it should be understood. We say nothing of the patriotism or even the propriety of this mode of reasoning, though we apprehend that the modes of cultivation ordinarily prevailing throughout England, are usually determined by similar considerations. It may be that Roman farmers arrive at a mistaken conclusion; but assuredly they intend, according to the report of Mr. Hillard, to go through the same process of reasoning by which landlords and tenants in this country are commonly guided. Patriotism would, we fear, lead very few of our countrymen to break up old pasture, unless they calculated it was likely to yield a profitable return. We do not presume to say whether Mr. Hillard is correct in his statement, or whether the Roman cultivators are correct in the alleged calculations; but we wish to draw attention to the peculiar view of this interesting question which our author suggests, and would recommend our friends to read and consider with some care his chapter upon it; indeed, we can with confidence recommend these volumes for general perusal.

ART. III.—*Thorndale, or the Conflict of Opinions.* By William Smith, author of "Athelwold, a Drama," "a Discourse on Ethics," &c. William Blackwood and Sons, Edinburgh and London.

THIS is a work of no ordinary mind. We have seldom seen infidelity more bewitchingly arrayed, or a philosophy more extravagantly false, taught in a manner more exquisitely beautiful. It is a consolation to us to believe that it will not be extensively read, and that the author will receive, at least, this practical illustration of the unsubstantiality of his dream of progress. This is a material age. Men traverse space on the tails of iron meteors; the men of one continent whisper in the ears of the men of another; whole towns move bodily across the ocean, sixteen miles an hour, night and day. Philosophy has little chance of being heard in the stir and clatter, and Mr. Smith is out of tune with his generation.

We have no hesitation in pronouncing "Thorndale" the ablest exposition that modern anti-Christianism has received. It is not a mere didactic enunciation of a cold, hard philosophy, which no truth can reach, because it does not offer an emotion to act upon. We remark in it a rare union of imagination and exactness of thought, two characteristics seldom found in combination. Mr. Smith's imagination is of a high order, and it has inspired his manner of speculating with an engaging modesty, painfully out of keeping with the heady arrogance of the conclusion to which he has been misled. To it, too, we ascribe a certain conscientiousness of thought which has led him, at times, very near to truth.

The design of Thorndale, in spite of its simplicity, is original. It is neither the dialogue of Plato, nor the didactic treatise of Aristotle, nor a poem such as the De rerum naturâ, nor a dramatic poem as the Bhagavat Gita; but it in a manner combines all, except that it has dramatic incidents and passages of poetic beauty of a higher order than any to be met with in the examples we have quoted. The author personates the editor of a MS., which purports to be the diary of a "meditative idler," one Charles Thorndale, who is excentric enough

to experience a "luxury and a triumph" in the mere act of thinking; and whose lungs and philosophy appear to offer about an equal amount of hope to body and soul. He has retired to the Villa Scarpa, a height above the Bay of Naples, in order to spend a few cozy months "with death (as himself expresses it) in the room with him, three paces off, just somewhere out of sight;" in order, it would appear, that they two might enjoy a short communion with nature, before his fellow-lodger should strike him out of it for ever. His diary has the appearance of being a mere instinctive relief to a disease which, any more than his organic one, has no hope of alleviation—a kind of mental expectoration. Neither is the unity of design of Thorndale in the least impaired, but rather it is assisted by the different form of the latter of the two parts into which it is divided; wherein the philosophy, which has been struggling through the dialogue of the former half, culminates into a didactic exposition of his philosophy by one of the interlocutors of the previous dialogue, entitled, "The Confession of Faith of an Eclectic and Utopian Philosopher." The persons of the dialogue would seem to be embodiments of the several elements of human consciousness, as they range themselves in Clarence's philosophy. Cyril is the religious or poetic;—Seckendorf, the materialistic, we were going to say;—but as we remember that Thorndale declines that epithet, we must describe him as the impersonation of the sensational elements—the Condillac of the system. Clarence is a consciousness in which these several elements are supposed to exist in a just and spontaneous combination; as much so, at least, as the æra of his particular development admits of. Thorndale himself appears to us, whether correctly or not we know not, as an impersonation of reason, or to use a word we very much prefer in this context, and which has, we think, usurped the name of reason in such philosophy as there is in this age, ratiocination. Too conscious of his own innate powers to be enough alive to their limitation, he has committed himself to his own keeping, as it were, and has lost his life. Withdrawing himself gradually, but with an unflinching audacity, from all objective worship, to gaze inward, like a miser on his stores, his consciousness has collapsed in the exterior darkness of a delusive and impotent subjectivity. He is portrayed before us as

a living doubt, haunting for a few years the scene of the glorious torture of his consciousness, and withdrawing then to the nothing from which he came. So little enamoured is he of the speculations he has committed to writing, that he calls in chance to decide, in his name, whether his fellowmen shall have them or the rats. The emotional part of the drama is undertaken by all natural love can make out of a woman, in the sufficiently pleasing episode of Winifrede. Each of these impersonations appropriates a distinct home in the reader's imagination from a kind of dramatic fidelity with which they are represented. And this effect is increased by the occasional introduction of incidents of true pathos and great dramatic effect, interspersed with passages, not too lavishly distributed, exquisitely poetic, tender, and we are not quite sure we may not add, sublime. Before leaving this part of our task for the less grateful one of dissecting a philosophy, which, we are quite sure, is utterly beneath the dignity of such an advocate, we cannot forbear noticing these charms of style which we could wish were relegated to a nobler mission, and in which it rises high above the hurriedly concocted, half-extemporised treatises of this railway age, compiled from all quarters, and groaning under the weight of quotations from every literary old-clothes store in existence. We have here, in a small compass, the fruit of many years patient thought; and whilst every page shows internal evidence of extensive reading, there is no attempt at display.

The first part, or dialogue, of Thorndale, is an exposition, in a fragmentary form, as of one musing, of the inexplicable, contradictory, and incomprehensible problems of human life. Throughout these, however, Clarence, ever and anon, keeps striking on the chord of hope, which echoes, out of unison, to his touch, more from its own innate vibration, than from any cogency of the arguments with which it is addressed. In the second, or didactic half, this one note takes up the entire strain. If there seems to be no longer discord, it is because the rest are silent, not harmonized. It is a monotone, not a chord. Our readers will already have been able to form some general notion of this writer's philosophical sytem; a system he himself has described by a name to which we have no disposition to except, Utopian!

Count Cavour has lately announced himself a philosopher of this school. The other day, in the Piedmontese parliament, apropos of fettering the liberties of the clergy, he said, "he had faith in progress!" In it, universal human society of all time is an organic whole, developing in a regular and ordained course of growth and progress to maturity and perfection. But, as no argument from experience is at hand for such a consummation, it is postponed to a future beyond all power of calculation, and would seem to inculcate hope for an inconceivably distant future from the very hopelessness of the past. In it, the individual destiny loses all significancy except in its relation to the whole. One's strictly personal being shrinks to a matter of sheer indifference and unconcern; each has a relation to the whole so minute, that no human powers of analysis can detect it; each fulfils this end and cannot help doing so. Like a blade of grass, (it is Clarence's own analogy,) the human atom appears in space, grows, withers, and corrupts. It has left its unrecognisable speck of contribution to the human universe, and there is an end of it. The whole universe, it is true, has contributed to that brief existence; but its entire meaning and significance are in that whole; all sensible existence is a manifestation of the Divine Idea, whose unity can only consist of relations, not of parts. Into it, the human I, like a ripple on the ocean, subsides and disappears. What if each of us, who are but invisibly small relations, cannot grasp the universal Idea? What if all within the sphere of our limited consciousness seems to be but a confused, heterogeneous chaos? If we could take our position with Him whose Idea it is, we should see it all; but since, as creatures, we cannot, we may be sure, as creatures, that, because it is the Divine Idea, it is a consummate Unity from first to last. We may, therefore, take it for granted, that some future, throw it onward as far as you please into distant ages, will reveal a perfect society upon this planet which has always appeared, until now, to be so ill-inhabited.

Such is, we think, a fair and just, so far as it goes, although of course very inadequate, sketch of Clarence's new revelation of reason. He, however, goes further. He professes to detect, in the past and present of human history, certain indications of growth or progressive development, such as to afford grounds enough for an inference

which, at the first blush, does not seem to be quite consequential.

To begin then, with Thorndale, who, personating reasoning doubt, has lapsed into unconsciousness as hope developes. He has put a manifest cheat upon himself when he fancies that the great question, mortal or immortal?—to be or not to be? "never interested him personally;" and that "with him such questions have generally run in the name of all humanity." (p. 28). No pen ever portrayed with a sadder fidelity than his own, the overwhelming personal interest of such speculations. Be he what he may, he can be that only a few months longer; and thus he writes:

"I have no hope. I talked of the climate, I thought only of the beauty of Italy. I have no hope, nor wish to have; this certainty is much better. I know well how near death is to me. He stands very close. It is his cold breath I now feel upon my brow: his cold hand has been laid in mine. We are fellow-lodgers in this sweet villa here. I owe to him half the beauty of this scene, and altogether owe to him the constant serenity with which I gaze upon it.

"I cannot describe that mysterious and tremulous calm with which I look upon this expanse of sun-lit waters—tremulous they also with light as I with feeling. Here as I sit at the open window, with this beautiful bay outstretched before me, the mind is stirred as with the music of unutterable thoughts. Happy memories, and every sweet emotion I have known, come back and crowd around me. 'Once more! once more! Look too on me! and on me!' each thought seems to utter as it passes.

"Strange! how the beauty and mystery of all nature is heightened by the near prospect of that coming darkness which will sweep it all away—that night which will have no star in it! These heavens, with all their glories, will soon be blotted out for me. The eye, and that which is behind the eye, will soon close, soon rest, and there will be no more beauty, no more mystery for me.

"These faculties of Sight and Thought, what godlike gifts they are! I feel as one to whom the wonders of creation were revealed for the first time, and for a single day. What an air of freshness, of novelty, and surprise does each old and familiar object assume to me when I think of parting with it for ever! I gaze insatiate; I muse and marvel unremittingly. I gaze as Milton's Adam did when he awoke—child and man at once,—awoke to maturest life, and looked out astonished, a *new-born man*, upon a new created world. Like him, too, I tremble as the sun goes down, lest the whole vision, dream and dreamer both, may vanish for ever. Every sunset I behold is my first, and my last."—pp. 22-3.

"In a very short existence what slow immeasurable periods—in a very little life, what length of days have I lived through! In a space that now seems nothing, I have felt as if I were dragging weary steps over some endless desert. How terrible seemed the purposeless and interminable futurity! Yet I had health *then*, and vigour of body and of mind. Now, here I lie in illness and in solitude, and lo! this mere seeing and thinking is as the life of a god.

"I know that death is in the room with me, three paces off—just somewhere out of sight. Have I not cause to look and listen eagerly?"—p. 24.

"Why should I wish to live? Have I not seen, and felt, and thought, as I could never again see, or feel, or think? Why desire old age, which is but the same world, with dimness and a film drawn over the vision of the man? Better lapse at once from youth into oblivion.

"What there is of brief and fitful enchantment in this life of man, I too have partly known. I have heard music; I have seen mountains; I have looked on the sea, and clouds, and flowing rivers, and the beauty of woman. I have loved; vainly or foolishly, I still have loved. I have known, too, that other enchantment, second only to it—that early dawn of meditative thought, when the stars of heaven are still seen in the faint fresh light of the morning: afterwards there is more light upon the earth, but there is no star; and we wait till the dark comes down upon us, before we see the heavens again.

"I have given my heart to the poets; I have listened eagerly to whatever great truth Science has revealed; I have trod the paths of philosophy, till I found them interlacing each other, and leading back to my own footmarks in the sand. I have had earnest thoughts and generous emotions. If I were to live for centuries, centuries would only bring me these in their decay and degeneracy. What but the withered leaf of summer has the winter to bestow?

"But this pause, this respite, this precious residue of life, let me welcome as it deserves. Silence and solitude, I can face you now! I bring to you a calm as imperturbable as your own. That suffering, by whatever name we call it, which springs from quickened susceptibilities and a blank of action, has at last left me. No long vista, dark with extinguished hopes, now lies before me, to be trodden to the end. Those coming years, so pale and joyless—those spectres of the future—will haunt me no more. At every pause of life they stood before me. I could not see the little plot of sunshine at my feet for gazing upwards at those fearful shadows. There was no rest at the halting-place; in the stillness there was no peace. Now all this is changed. Time has once for all set

down his hour-glass before me: there it stands; a few sands, precious as gold, are all that remain. How swiftly they run! and there is no hand can turn the glass!"—pp. 26-7.

"I weary of this conflict—of this eternal wrangle of my own thoughts. Silence! I crave silence, peace, and a pause to this incessant din and tumult of reflection. There is silence deep enough in the air around me. But who shall still for me this loud and contradictory talking that is perpetually going on within?"—p. 363.

"This joy is not lost. It *is*, and will continue to be. Why must it be *mine?*"—p. 364.

"What is it has unhinged me? *I* must not weary of solitude. There is no choice now, and no room for that indecision which ever makes a full half of our calamities. There is but one simple necessity—to endure on here to the end. And the end is not far off."—p. 364.

There is no evidence here of such speculations "running only in the name of all humanity." That must have been a subsequent stage; an escape from their personal importunities. The ostrich has buried its head in the sand. Thorndale repudiates the rite of sacrifice; he pronounces it the offspring of a childish imagination: but he offers a costly one to a conjecture. He immolates himself to *his* God. His Utopia requires his own personality for its first victim; and he offers it without shrinking. The patriarch of faith was ready to sacrifice his own son; the hierophant of incredulity has voluntarily lain upon the altar the fire which is to consume himself. The disobedience of the one is more cruel than the obedience of the other. By dint of life-long thought, he achieves a calm so terrible that we look at it with half-averted gaze. It is an awful acquiescence in a self-extinction which is needed for the good of all. The great question of life receives an answer not one whit less terrible than annihilation, because, out of my annihilation, amongst others, is to develop a perfect generation in far distant ages, when my proper consciousness will not even own so much existence as the subtlest gas, and when it can nothing concern me whether earth be peopled with gods or devils.

But, after all, this is only passing on the question to a repetition of selves. Our sympathies, we own, take a quite different direction: our love yearns towards so fair a soul so unkind to itself. We long to be permitted to restore that abdicated immortality. It is because the

immortality of our own individual consciousness is so personal a conviction that we have sympathy at all. All objectivity gone, the individual man would collapse in an intense introvertence, and perish like the scorpion with his sting in his own brain.

Thorndale does not categorically deny the dogma of the immortality of the individual consciousness; but he has no place for it in his philosophy, which, from the nature of the subject, is tantamount to denying it. If, as Clarence has it, "*society is immortal*," and the end of man is "*a perfect terrestrial society*," we are at a loss to conjecture either what end could be subserved by a personal immortality, or what possibility there could be of it. Thorndale suggests the strange and most difficult idea of a re-creation.

"For myself I am very little interested in these debates about the material or immaterial substance. My organic frame, or one like it, can, if it please the Creator, be reconstructed in any part of the universe. So that if you insist upon the necessity of an organic frame to my thinking, even this would not render impossible the perpetuity of my consciousness. There is no necessity to suppose that we take anything *out of the world*, material or immaterial. *The creation is where God is.*"—p. 54.

We wish we could take this as an admission of the imperishability of the individual consciousness. If that be admitted, the manner in which it is evolved from organic death is not of moment, so far as mere reason is concerned. If the thinking conscious I is to be the thinking conscious I for ever, it matters not whether, at the failure of our organization, we revert for a while to our Creator, like a rivulet to the sea, to be reproduced by Him; whether a similar organization is to be reconstructed more perfectly for the completion of our eternal personality; or whether, if such an idea be compatible with that of individual immortality, an altogether other personality be created for us. But when, given the future existence of the dead I, it is suggested that "it can carry nothing out of this," the argument appears to us to limp sensibly. If the future is to be, as it were, a distinct creation, if the individual is to become extinct, though only for a while, at the collapse of his present organization, if he is to lose his individual consciousness in eternal being, to be reproduced as a distinct creation on a happier soil and under a

less fitful sun, with what idea of God, of human perfection even, can we reconcile that creation of which alone we are cognizant? Of which, indeed, Thorndale's own description is, "Looking round the world, it is very hard to find one's immortals or celestials that are to be." And again, "The hardest trial to our faith (?) is the actual aspect of the living multitudes of mankind." (p. 54). Doubtless, were faith only "opinion developed in action." (p. 44). But there is a faith, as truly as there is a living consciousness, which brings with it a re-creation. It is able to scan the displeasing aspect of life less sternly. Before the patrician villa echoing with ribald mirth, or the houseless group munching their ill-gotten garbage under the shelter of a ruined wall (p. 55) she stands pensive indeed, but not as Thorndale, perplexed. Even now, behind the eye-ball of the robber or the profligate, may those tears be secreting which shall wash away, through a virtue within their reach, every particle of dross, and leave nothing but the purest gold. A thief once stepped from his gibbet into paradise: a harlot passed straight from lust to love.

What, again, makes theft or luxury, crime and degradation? Happiness is relative. The thief is as happy as Dives. A successful robbery, and a jovial debauch, are the sources of an equal satisfaction to the performers. Both are happier than Thorndale with his intensely developed consciousness of an immortality in which he does not believe. He is like the bird he so exquisitely describes. (p. 42.) He hangs alone between an illimitable abyss and an illimitable heaven. But his own wings have done their utmost. Now he must either stoop or soar. Our crimes or our virtues are the development of our destinies, which are out of our own control. It is the use we make of those destinies which determines their morality. Clarence eases us of all responsibility in the matter. All is a necessary development. But how can this be? Is there no such thing as vice? Is it a mere conventional creation of police and jurisprudence? A mere accident of a certain stage of society? Is it true of human governments, as of the Divine, "ubi non est lex, nec prævaricatio?" Thorndale thinks it is, and Clarence agrees with him. But this would be an immense imperfection in the most perfect work of the Creator. Does this man or that forfeit his present consciousness, throbbing

with immortality, for the mere gratification of wants generated by human intercourse? And why this tremendous bodily, but still more poignant mental, agony of death? If there be a responsibility, is organic life a lustration—the same to all, the virtuous and the vicious, the murderer and the philanthropist? Does the collapse of this sensible existence compound for all?

The fact is, however, in spite of a protestation or two, which would seem to convey a contrary impression, that Clarence's philosophy excludes the hypothesis of the immortality of the individual consciousness. Its personal end does not reach beyond its own imperceptibly minute limitation, which itself is but an atomic contribution to an infinite unity; a quite unrecognizable particle of the mass. With it go moral responsibility, crime, eternal, or any other divine retribution, the judicial tribunal of the Creator, man's whole moral being, in short. The new Utopia makes a clean sweep of all. All these definitions and sanctions of religion have been, and are, nothing else than expedients discharging a certain temporary purpose in an ordered and inevitable development. All religions alike are both false and true, false in themselves, true in their contribution to the unfolding truth. God Himself is deposed. There is no throne for Him in His own creation. There is such a personality, it is said, because man's consciousness is only comprehensible as a manifestation of the Divine Idea. But nothing can be predicated of Him. He can only be human to our consciousness. We cannot catch a glimpse of Him except in that idea; and as that idea does not reveal Him, He must exist somewhere outside of it. Incomprehensibility must exist, because we can comprehend nothing without a reference to it. But He can have no existence to us because He is outside of everything we can comprehend. Hell is only a fiction devised for the succour of reason in a rude stage of development, until it has grown into sufficient strength to be a match for the passions, which are the first and the strongest in the order of growth. The God whom men have been wont to venerate is nought but a creation of their own passions, an exalted personality, with nothing but human attributes, placed by the dreaming conjecture of imagination somewhere out of space, changing its nature to every climate and every epoch of the world. The sublime philosophy of the Church is travestied. The

teaching of her inspired books is quoted in a sense that parodies it. Man's responsibility, God's justice, and all essential distinction between vice and virtue are swept aside, because "Perfect Love casteth out Fear."* The only individual immortality admitted to be probable is that of a few of "scientific culture;" and this only by a juggle of re-creation. Idiots, the poor, the ignorant, the coarse and vulgar of the several conventionalities are too low down in the order of development to be worth an immortality. As well make a celestial of an ass or a hog. The only individual accountability thus, is, proximately to the privileged few of the contemporary generation, ultimately, to their remote descendants. Whosoever so acts as to retard, or appear to do so, the development of the few of his time, and so of the perfect time, has committed an offence against the whole developing social organization. That is crime, if there be such a thing, neither more nor less. The tribunal that takes cognizance of it is the terrestrial society and its order of development. There is no other. It itself will gradually tone down, as the topmost few, and with them their tributaries, the multitudes, keep mounting to higher stages of development; until each, even the very lowest, excepting perhaps idiots, and other lusus naturæ, will have entered upon the inheritance of so complete a spontaneity of public spirit that there will be no further need for the temporary dispensation of human justice. The society of men will be one universal, world-wide, joint-stock-bank of impeccable partners, the keepers of the till beyond suspicion, no depositor usuriously inclined, the balancers of the ledgers and the directors of operation having no more than "food, clothes, and fire," the humblest depositor no less, not a unit of the species without enough, not a unit wanting more, time as happily economized as toil, science grasping the horny palms of clowns, and sweating through the fallows, this "planet Tellus," in short, ringing from end to end with one unbroken Alleluia of contentment, keeping exact

* We have to complain of the liberties Clarence has taken with the Sacred text. At p. 543 he writes, "It is very true, as the great Hebrew Prophet said, that God does, from time to time, 'write a new law in our hearts.'" No Hebrew prophet, great or small, ever uttered such a sentiment.

time with the chink of guineas, the impatience of compressed caloric, and the rattle of looms. The general judgment will have passed insensibly in the growth of ages, science will have done her work, her teachers—the philosophers—will have fulfilled their mission, "religion will be something better and higher than an auxiliary to the constable or the magistrate," (p. 20) an oligarchy of human perfection, a terrestrial heaven, will occupy its proper home as the result of untold ages of undeveloping misery and degradation, the Divine Idea will be manifested in its Oneness, (unsatisfactory as that may seem to be,) the laws and punishments which answered some disagreeable purpose low down in the stalk of the tree of life, will have become extinct long back, for "Perfect love will have cast out fear." For our own part we can only wonder that Clarence has not dragged another Catholic aphorism into the uncoveted service of this excessively oligarchical Utopia. If the multitude—the plebs—conscious of some real equality with the greatest lights of human science, conscious of that within them which is superior to this degrading ministry assigned to them in the order of development, claim something vociferously their share, too, of immortality, may he not appease their ambition with the doctrine that "many are called, but few chosen?"

But we are anticipating. Clarence will, at least, admit that it is no hasty or flippant criticism we are venturing to indulge. He will own that to the best of our ability, such as it is, we have mastered the idea of his philosophy, and have not described it unfairly. If he should complain of an occasional lack of gravity of tone on our part, our apology must be, that the limits to which we are restricted put it out of our power to reply at length to much he has advanced which demands notice; and we are, consequently, driven to give such a description of some of those portions of his work as may suggest, as it proceeds, a few of the more salient objections. For the same reason we shall have to reply to much he brings forward without producing the arguments he has employed, leaving what they are to be conjectured from our own.

One capital error shakes the foundation of the whole metaphysical system which goes along with Clarence's philosophy of life; and that is, the inferior, and indeed altogether subordinate, position occupied in it by the

'emotional,' or, as we should prefer to call it, if we thought we should not be misunderstood, the 'intuitive' element of the human consciousness, together with the unreasonably exaggerated position assigned to its discursive faculty. Upon the subtle point of the human consciousness itself, he has not made himself so clear as we could have wished, and we think he is not quite consistent. We gather that he believes it to be a relation co-existent with the organic creation, but developed in it as a subsequent creation. He argues, indeed, and rightly, that a simple existence—a pure atom—is not conceivable by the human consciousness. The simplest idea it is capable of is of a relation, which issues straight from our sensible organization. A relation is of two. And no simpler conception is possible in time and space. One or two of the stock metaphysical fallacies on this subject, he disposes of very cleverly. But yet, beyond that pure atom, or simple created existence, he recognizes by arguments, which we shall have to notice, a distinct personal creative existence—an Author of the pure atom and its stupendous developments, who, as simple Being, not consisting of relations, is ever creating, as from the first; and, it should have been added, as perfectly created, as to the last. For, first and last, past and future, and succession, are relations. Nay, he rushes into a seemingly other extreme, of fatalism. He refers directly to His Personal Deity, (p. 451) the power which determines the form, shape, or condition of the individual consciousness. A view which, it is easy to see, obliterates human responsibility, and exhibits that terrific and most repulsive history of misery and sin, which has already embraced a period of nearly 6000 years, as the immediate work of the finger of God's particular providence. In this Clarence would seem to separate himself from rationalists of the school of Spinosa, Descartes, or Hegel, from even the two 'naturas,' naturans and naturata, of Schelling, and also from the absolute I of Fichte. But the difference is more nominal than real. For, since such a Being can never become accessible to human consciousness, nor ever, consequently, an object of its love or worship, He may as well be that ultimate atom in itself and all its issues, as some Being beyond that. We do not know that we could urge anything very conclusive against this, if it were true that what the nineteenth century worships under the attributes of reason were the one great

dominating element of the consciousness, or still less if it were, what it is literally represented to be, merely another way of calling the developed consciousness itself. As to Clarence's assertion of this view there can be no doubt. For, not now to invoke the witness of nearly every page of his 'Eclectic confession,' he adduces "*a highly developed intelligence, and a sufficiency of food, clothes, and firing for each,*" as the chief good of man, and ultimate aspect of his developed Utopia (p. 526). That he possesses an inner conviction of the personal Being of the Creator we have no doubt. But his reasonings do not bring him to Him. It is prior to them, and stronger than they are, so long as he keeps possession of it, and he makes interest with them not to take it away from him. He labours for arguments in its behalf. But they are inexorable. So that while he asserts very confidently the Being of a Creator, he nowhere insists on His Personality. If he should demur to this statement we can only say that his philosophy cannot. He detects, of course, the inadequacy of 'the design' argument to demonstrate the existence of a Personal Creator, and disabuses it of any pretensions to that effect, with inimitable power and effect. But he steps himself into the vacant usurpation. To argue the existence of a Personal Creator from such an interdependence of the whole on the parts, and the parts on the whole, as constitutes an organic unity, we are unable to see in any other light, as we have already intimated, than as a reproduction of the design argument in another shape. We are not denying the force of the argument. It does come in with immense subsidiary power. But neither as it has been ordinarily used, nor in the still more forcible application which Clarence makes of it, can it be of any service to minds of the Seckendorf type—to any form or shape of rationalism, that is. On the contrary, except as a re-application of the design argument, it appears to us to cut the other way. It amputates a Personal Creator from His universe, which, inasmuch as it is a whole, does not stand in need of a complement. Surely the argument from the harmonious co-operation of the atoms and groups of the universe, and the mutual and developing interdependence of the whole and its parts, is in behalf of the spontaneity of their development, unless you can introduce some evidence of an intelligent end throughout sufficiently circumstantial to put the spontaneity of development out

of court; and then you have not got a Personal God unless every atom of the development is fully conscious throughout. And what after all would it be but an argument from design? To say that this vast unity of infinitely diversified co-operating individuals must, because of its harmony or unity, be a manifestation of the Idea of a Personal Creator, is only like what Clarence says of the German Speculatists, "putting another word on the rack" instead of 'Absolute Being,' and the like, "and trying to extort a truth out of it." We can only recognize "the old illusion of converting a general term into an entity" (p. 416). Human thought is incapable of embracing a whole, so that there is no elevation thereabouts from which a conception of self-existence can be apprehended.

Of the human consciousness the ultimate truth we can arrive at, the 'last word' of mental science is, that there is a consciousness of an objective unconsciousness—a knowledge that there is what is not known. If there be one appreciable idea throughout the entire universe, one word which the spheres and the motes speak in unison, it is that. What is the one great product of all we men call by the name of science? What is it but an accretion of our powers of comprehension of the illimitable beyond? We are at the foot of the mountain; we think we detect the summit up there in the clouds; we have reached it, lo! another far more inaccessible elevation; we have climbed and toiled there too, lo! a sea of summits lost in elevation and distance; after incredible toil and painful co-operation of many, one of those yet higher eminences is achieved; again it has only enlarged our sphere of vision; *the* summit—the end—the prospect of the end does nothing whatever but recede as we advance. The flagging spirit droops on the last hillock it has climbed; it seems a great height as it gazes downwards, nothing as it strains its sight onwards and upwards; something goaded by its sensations, it turns its back upon the former, and over-prizing the latter, calls it science. But the illimitable beyond is still in view; it is there. The man of 'scientific culture' may turn his back upon it, but he cannot get rid of the fuller knowledge he has attained.*

* "Our knowledge of the properties and laws of physical objects shows no sign of approaching its ultimate boundaries; it is advancing more rapidly, and in a greater number of directions at

He has made many guesses—as many false as true—in the long toil of science; but one truth he has placed out of doubt. That horizon where heaven and earth seem to blend is only an imaginary line. There is no limit except to our powers. Were we where that horizon seems to be, it would still be before us, as far off as ever. And when we compare our great science with that limitless more, it has helped to open up to us, how puny, how infinitely small it is.

Neither is the process such as Clarence describes it. He will have it to be "a necessary transition through imagination or guess-work into truth." "We exchange," he urges, "our imaginations for theories. There is a necessary transit through error into science." So that this vast and lovely universe, above, below, and around, is after all only a mighty and ingenious puzzle, which God created man to keep guessing at until he had put it all together, and found it out. We do not think this is a noble view of life, and we are quite sure it is not a correct one. The development of human knowledge is, from first to last, throughout all, everywhere, an unintermitting, unceasing discrimination between truth and error, in which the emotions have as clear, and even more efficient office than the reason. Whether it be in theology, or natural or speculative science, in every instance he has to make his voluntary and responsible decision between what is at the same time good as well as true, or bad as well as false. There must, wherever truth is in question, be a moral as well as mental decision, however much the latter may seem, at times, to preponderate over the former. The whole science of nature, if we were in possession of it, would not be truth, but only true so far as it went. The end of the sensible universe is not an intellectual exercise, or a stimulus of growth. The science of nature occupies but a very subordinate significance in the human consciousness. The whole universe of organic and inorganic existence is the scene of an omnipotent arbitration, wherein each human being in a succession of conflicting alternatives becomes for ever what his actions make

---

once, than in any previous age or generation, and affording such frequent glimpses of unexplored fields beyond, as to justify the belief that our acquaintance with nature is still almost in its infancy."—*Mill's Political Economy*, vol. ii. p. 247.

him. "The guess-work" of the imagination does not, as Clarence argues, (p. 573) "assume a very different character as science advances;" "our knowledge" has not "taught us how to conjecture." It has supplied us with more facts, nothing more. Laws develop out of a widening induction. Reason which comes to a wrong conclusion is not a different process from reason which comes to a right. Of reason *alone* is true what he predicates of the human consciousness. Its δυναμις being there, it develops in ενεργειαι, subject, however, to ebb and flow. It is, indeed, always more or less conjecture, because of its limited powers, and the consequent uncertainty of its conclusions. But the finding out its mistakes, or which is the same thing, the development of what is true in the subject, is a matter of time. Always, however, the same process. It is not one thing, whether fancy or conjecture, at its earliest stage, and another, reason, at its latest. It is always the identical instrument, only more skilfully handled. It is always digging, delving reason, throwing up all along a great quantity of dirt and rubbish, and, now and then, a jewel or a precious stone. It is always more or less guess-work, never nothing else. Cosmogonies, astrologies, all had some truth in them; so had the wildest mythologies; so, too, every political or social theory. Truth, like life, is everywhere. The portion of truth that is in the sensible creation, reason keeps groping out from day to day. Whether any progress has been made, we, at all events, feel ourselves unable to decide If there has it is something imperceptibly small. If, upon the strength of a few mechanical contrivances, or the accidental discovery of an application of some one or two of the proximate powers of nature, we lose our appreciation of what we do not know, we shall have gone back.

All nature, all science, agree to testify 'there is something else.' Somewhere here it is that a self-existence develops as a truth. Love depicts quite vividly a feature or two of the Divine lineaments on the soul. Revelation, at its own time, and in its own manner, lifts a portion of the inaccessible veil, indicates His Personality, and attends Him stooping into the limits of His own sensible creation. Then reason looks back and onwards upon the sensible universe, and lo! it is embosomed in a light of which it had never been conscious until now,—a light which streams into its innermost convictions, reveals its

beauty and its truth at once, and fills the consciousness with a sense of the very great nearness of God. Feature by feature, as the human mind, in this phenomenal existence, apprehends either truth or beauty, blended in an indistinct, but very real idea of the whole, come forth upon the beautiful universe, a mediate ministry, vicarious suffering, life out of death, and the like. The great doctrine of the sensible creation is its suggestiveness. This too, it is, which constitutes its beauty. Whether you heap all nature together in one imposing synthesis, or depict her by the most curious and profound analysis, you add nothing to the intrinsic force of the argument from design. Whether it be the whole or the simplest expression of the whole, its significance must be the same, or be useless as an argument.

To hazard the statement that "things are thoughts," is to attempt a definition of simple existence—a truth which no human argument can reach. Objective being is a fact prior to all reasoning. It must be accepted as a fact before we can reason at all. Moreover our generalizations, or abstractions, must issue from it, and work through it, and in it. There can be no cavil here. And yet this great postulate from which we are able to argue that God is, is quite out of the reach of our understanding. Such is the mystery and the way of sensible life. Immortality gushing through corruption—Death, master of a living soul—Eternity, pent up as it were in time. A unit whom less than six cubic feet of substance holds inexorably fast, conscious of the *nature* of the occupancy of all space, indefinitely beyond any known horizon, and of an existence still stretching out illimitably beyond and around the entire circuit even of that. The testimony of mere intellect cannot be strong. Its strongest is, 'that I am superior to my bondage; and as I am at the summit of the sensible creation, there must be a greater being somewhere.' The term 'atom' stands for the last and simplest 'ens' we arrive at in our analysis of objective existence. This cannot be, as Clarence justly argues, a quite simple existence, although the simplest we can arrive at. But we are not hereby helped to define what a pure atom, or the first objective existence is. If we were we should be able to go on and define spiritual existence—thought, love, or whatever it might be. There is but this line between the two. To maintain, then, that "things are thoughts,"

(p. 421) conveys no more meaning than that there is a condition of existence beyond the reach of any analysis or science at our command.

Each human consciousness can point to a commencement and an end of every other individual except himself. There was never an exception to this. Although, therefore, he has never possessed a consciousness of his own beginning, nor, of course, of his end, both are to him matters of absolute unerring certainty. Every one knows for certain that his present consciousness dates from a year or two back, and will cease to exist, so far as his utmost science can give him any information on the subject, a year or two hence. Between the two extremes is growth—the ordinary organic growth. Everything here then is dead against an immortality. The argument is very conclusive against any such thing. The very existence of an idea of immortality in such a condition of life reverses the balance. The argument now is all dead in favour of an immortality. "Who can think," says Thorndale, "upon that other and greater problem—the nature of Him who perchance sits central amidst the stars—and not feel that a creature who can—who must—state such problems to himself, is surely destined, one day, somewhere, to have them solved for him?" (p. 57.) That is nearly the finest, because the truest passage of his diary.

Here then is a consciousness inconsistent with the recognizable conditions of the phenomenal being of man. In all the rationalisms there is a great deal of truth. So, in this sense, that being is '*the negation of an opposite.*'

Clarence has thus a false cue at starting; and he becomes more confused the farther he moves into the metaphysical labyrinth. Gleams of light may reach him in a direction utterly away from that in which he is travelling, but he cannot follow them. He would not receive his clue; he would make it. Now he must recommence or never emerge. His clue is his only hope, and it is dragging him away inexorably from immortality and God. We have never stumbled across a more hopeless materialism than his. As regards the phenomenal consciousness of each, we cannot detect the slightest difference between his philosophy and Condillac's. In both the intellectual consciousness is a product of the sensational. And as to his future society, of which he predicates immortality and perfectibility, in what does it differ from the philosophy which

preceded the French revolution? That premature experiment was the work of selfish and vicious socialists. We do not apprehend that its great lights contemplated any other than a transitional and ordered development any more than does Clarence.

"With the full development of memory," he argues, "this reproduction of the perceptions of sense, in order of time, and so that relations may be felt, or comparisons made between them—with this commences our intellectual being, our true spirituality, and only *subjectivity*." (pp. 446-7.)

If this were so, the infant would not own a subjectivity! Up to a given time it has not the capacity of thought. It is in no way superior, and is therefore inferior to a sucking ape. It receives its "intellectual being, its true spirituality, and only subjectivity" afterwards. This being so, the external creation which has caused its sensitiveness to develop into consciousness must be the creator of that true spirituality. The organic creation is thus the higher of the two; for the Creator has made it His vicar in dispensing to man his highest life, and that which is supposed to exalt him to the headship of creation. This is untenable. Each human being has his or her intellectual being from the first. Its full recognition of self—its issue out of waking intuition into comparisons and memories—may be a subsequent development, as its subtler essence finds the resistance of a grosser element, like the scattered sun-rays before they are re-collected to a focus; but cannot, in any save a highly figurative sense, be called a commencement.

The very moral being of the *individual* man is, in Clarence's philosophy, a development from his organization. Seckendorf relates (p. 290) a circumstance that came by chance under his observation: "A citizen of Berlin, noted for his wretched and violent temper, ended his career by blowing out his brains. 'Look under the dura mater,' said some one, 'and see if there are not some osseous deposits.' The operator did not fail to look, and, lo! there were osseous deposits, evidently, as they all pronounced, of a very irritating sort!" Clarence had no answer to this. He was only an individual. And in Utopia we presume there will be no "osseous deposits under the dura mater." But this cerebral infirmity only constituted a portion of that particular citizen's destiny. He had

with it a stronger element of his consciousness, which was quite able to repress the irritating effects. If Clarence be not, what he is not far from being, a fatalist, he must admit that he *need* not have blown his brains out, for all the inconvenience they afforded him. His yielding to the weaker motive was a fault. The sensible organism is the seat of propensions, *however provoked*, of which the supra-sensible consciousness (to which we have already alluded) which constitutes the complement of the individual unity, is by creation and essence the natural lord. But, its absolutism reaches further yet; for it is able to become their slave. As it stands, one would think the existence of such an option to be a mere formality. A freedom not over much significant or valuable because of the exceeding improbability of one alternative. Experimentally it is not so. We know that what would seem to be the only probable use of this liberty is in practice very hard; that the sensible propensions are very strong; so that if the superior consciousness escape its subjugation by the lower, it is universally hailed as an achievement and a victory.

The human being is in a stage of his creation in which he finds his conscious nature adapted to certain ends which do not satisfy him. Unlike other animals, when he has fulfilled all the proximate ends of his organic nature he is still unsated. Take the most favourable instance, Solon's ideal of human happiness, than which Aristotle himself could excogitate no higher. The enjoyment of the youths was as transitory as its causes. It would not have lasted. When the Divinity answered their mother's grateful prayer, he taught that this sensible life does not contain the end for which man was made. Aristotle, indeed, lays it down that no one is to be counted happy until he has come to the end of life. But can that be called happiness, as he himself asks, which cannot be owned until the instant when it is forsaking us? Contentment does not outlast the moment of possession. This incapacity of enjoyment it is which is the source of nearly all the suffering of life. Let every longing be satisfied, still unslaked is the craving for something else. It is a morbid appetite. All the creatures of God cannot appease it. Toil, mental or bodily, comes in literally to the rescue of human happiness. No other animal, not the bee nor the ant, toils, because the lower animals fulfil their end and rest in it. To the human animal the burden of life is

unbearable without toil. When men can toil for nothing else, they toil, and industriously too, for pleasure. If the keenest pleasures are not found in it, it is the source of the most steady and unflagging satisfaction. Here man finds himself nearest fulfilling his end. The cheeriest music known is in the same field with the lark. The plough-tail beats the opera all to nothing in that matter. The philosopher would wither up in bloodless despondency, if the labour of thinking did not keep him going. "Pater meus usque modo operatur et Ego operor," says God in the nature of man. Man's experience justifies the revelation. His own bosom reveals to him in 'work' a manifestation of the Divine Idea. It is in this respect that he is, within the domain of his own personality, God's vicegerent. He works to a pattern. That pattern is the Divine Idea. Here is that august creative prerogative with which he is invested. Here beauty and wisdom combine, and rush into the embrace of love. It is when man abdicates this grand vicegerency, when he abandons the intelligence of toil, that his existence becomes meaningless to him. Nothing whatever that he does brings the satisfaction of an end fulfilled. Retaining the same capacities with their glorious emotions, he has robbed them of their action. He has not put them out at interest. He has folded them up in a napkin and laid them by. *Ὅσα μὲν φύσει ἡμιν παραγίνεται, τὰς δυνάμεις τούτων πρότερον κομιζόμεθα, ὕστερον δὲ τὰς ενεργείας ἀποδίδομεν.* (Ar. Nic. Eth. B. 26-8. Bekker.)

If he could annihilate these *δυνάμεις* there might be something to be said. But that would be to annihilate himself. They are not submitted to his election, any more than he was asked whether he would be, or not be. Their *ἐνεργέιαι* are, absolutely. He may rob them of their work, but he cannot hinder their depriving him of his pleasure. His supremacy of will extends to the power of enslaving himself to his own subjects; but their utmost obsequiousness, though it should contrive to divert him from the meaning of hours, days, nay, years, can never wholly obliterate the memory that he is by birth their lord and king.

In Clarence's psychology the *ἐνεργέιαι* are developments of the *δυνάμεις*. There is no inherent vice in the "this" or the "that" of human actions. The only bad man is the one who does not respect the public good. There is another development which moulds him into harmony with the rest—to wit—human law or opinion. His only respon-

sibility is to it. The imagination of men in an early stage of human development, has placed a supreme court of appeal in heaven, as it elevated monarchical power into a personal God. The idea of eternal punishment, or any other punishment inflicted by the Creator, took its rise altogether in the exigencies of human society. A higher developed reason rejects the idea as inconsistent with the very idea of an omnipotent Creator. But surely this confessedly difficult problem is not submitted to reason at all. We have far more trustworthy witnesses in court. Reason may ask why man is punished, but his senses tell him that he is. Reason may not be able to make out why she has the tooth-ache, but if she doubt its possibility, the sooner she has it the better. The existence of suffering—its universality—seems to us to settle the question of moral responsibility. About its being a punishment how can a doubt have place? We roar and writhe. That is no subject of speculation. If every other sensation might be distrusted, this cannot be. Neither is it that this man suffers, that not; but all alike. Nor is one period of life its victim, the rest exempt. It haunts each throughout the duration of his organic existence. Neither, indeed, is it a slight flavour with which the cup of joy is dashed—a brackish taste in the water of life. It is the feature, the one prevailing attribute of animal life. Nor of that only. It culminates in the crowning work of creation—the image of his Maker—to an intensity altogether beyond the nature of the lower animals. It reaches his subtler essence. *His soul suffers.* Envy, jealousy, humiliation, disappointed love, and the like! Their seat of suffering is not in the nerves. Then there is something deep down in his spiritual being, that never sleeping consciousness which keeps pointing to suffering in the distance, which lends it a force it has not in the nerves; and which, in spite of all our efforts, arms death with an agony of which the mere strangulation is but the dimmest of types. And then again, there is that unadaptation of this life to any present end which makes it one continuous sorrow. The soul has an incapacity for enjoyment or acquiescence in this life—and what is that but suffering? *Now,* if reason begins to speculate, if now she asks why is this, she is obliged to suppose guilt. It is the rational inference. Surely, it would be more irrational than to gape at all this suffering as a sheer wantonness of Omnipotence; than to accuse the

Creator of trifling with the torments of His myriad creatures, as a fisherman might with the worm upon his hook. But this is not all. That exhaustless hope, which is the great alleviation of human suffering, induces with it a sentiment of responsibility. Good and evil become right and wrong. The two ways are felt to lead in different directions. The innate perception of right and wrong ripens into a sense of duty. Then, if following the import of our twofold conformation, not withdrawing our reason from our intuition, we develop it in action, the prospect brightens, the fog begins very gradually to disperse; sad sombre suffering lifts her eyelids; her gaze is steady, calm, and not all unjoyful; she is the heroine of a grand lustration; her garments are mean and penitential, but they are the habit of the novitiate of an immortal athlete; a fitful, passionate, half-mad existence she has exchanged for a profound endurance and a welcome toil, the seat of the holiest sympathies and a transporting love. She looks onwards for her end—not here. Following the truth of her own nature, she abandons the vain hope of looking for life among the tombs. She recognizes it as the result of those habits whose actions are even now accompanied with no ambiguous intimations of a life of which love or happiness is the essence and the end.

We must now go back a pace or two to return soon to the same point. Clarence teaches us that there is one force or law, which embraces all known life, to wit, that of development. From the first for ever it progresses, from the atom to the perfect and immortal society of men; a cone of life beginning from a point, and bulging into eternity, putting forth every known existence in an inevitable course of growth, so that no individual of the myriads which compose its manifestation, can have the smallest choice as to where it shall be, or what it shall be, in that development. This is not so. Reason herself has much to say against this dead materialism.

The attraction and gravitation of the organic universe, have their counterpart in the spiritual nature of man. Yet, what comparison can be instituted between them? Whether those laws or any other, be the dynastic forces of organic life, all their creatures are their necessary results in every stage of growth, or throughout all known cycles of immutability; nor can they (the creatures) exercise the faintest influence upon their operation. There

are no voluntary energies possible till you come to man. Here, however, an intrinsically different phenomenon presents itself. You see an organic nature indeed which, at the first sight, appears to be, like the rest, a mere passive product of extrinsic forces. But, as we look nearer, we find the individual of this order of creation conscious of a power, a δύναμις within him, which is able even whilst its organic manifestation is held by organic laws, to take him altogether out of that organic consciousness to the most distant parts of the universe—to throw him out indeed of a subjective sufficiency, to an objective hope. And this, as we have seen, is the end of science. This would be much in itself. But it is not all. It would but be a glorious diversion from the sorrow of life for a favoured few. It would not change their nature. It would merely be a matter of more or less, not a question of this or that. Aristotle falls into a very palpable mistake when he divides virtues into intellectual and moral. There is no such thing as an intellectual virtue. But, it may be objected, the intellectual energies are voluntary; of two individuals circumstanced precisely the same, one may become a great scholar, or natural, or metaphysical philosopher, or what not, whilst the other remains an ignoramus. True. And the latter may be a model of virtue, the former a monster of depravity. It may be the other way too. The value or virtue of a voluntary action depends wholly on its motive. The student who shall have discovered the gravitation of the spheres, or have demonstrated the geometrical whole of the organic universe, if he have worked for no other end than the gratification of the particular taste he finds himself in possession of, has done a no better action, quoad se, than the jackal who, for the same end, has just disembowelled a human carcass. Intellectual energies may be acts of moral virtue, but intellectual virtues do not exist.

There is, therefore, in the human being, a somewhat superior to reason and to all sensible existence, which gives to the two antagonistic forces of which it is conscious the force they shall respectively exercise with regard to itself; and decides supremely, therefore, what shall be the product of their operation. It is this that destroys any real analogy between man and the subsidiary creation, which lifts him clean out of the category of organic life. All else is a mere development of passive subject from

living law, an infinitely varied manifestation of inevitable growth. The human being, however, receives like the rest, his subject and his law, the material or essence, and the knowledge how to work it. After that, the Creator's work in his case, is limited to encouragement or rebuke, as it may be, and co-operation, all of which he can decline, so that he is effectively the instrument of his own creation. Aristotle perceived much of this. Energies, he teaches, are voluntary, they make habits, habits the man; so that if a man has such a habit, it may be predicated of him that he is so and so, if the acts or energies belong to a certain habit, or permanent condition of consciousness, afford him pleasure. That is, if he has a sense in them of fulfilling his end. Each individual is thus, concurrently with God, his own Creator. He becomes what his habits make him, and they are the result of his actions, which are voluntary. He is thus, so to speak, the creation. All besides are but so many superabundant contributions, inferior tributaries, to his being; a being which, unlike those organic subsidies, is as yet unfinished, is in process of creation, is being evolved out of them by a wonderful law, the ordinary administration of which the Creator has, concurrently with Himself, delegated to him. He has shared with His creature His own omnipotence, so that, from the first to the last of the multitudes who are ever streaming through the sensible creation, what each shall eventually be is so completely in his own power, that He who gave him that power, though he foresees, cannot, as men speak, give an absolute direction to the exercise of it. He is entrusted, within his single domain, with that supreme jurisdiction which revelation informs us has been deposited with the See of Rome, in all that regards that grander creation of which each is but a single orb,—that consummate universe, of which this necklace of suns that circles a spot of the infinite, is but as a faint shadow on the wall.

We have shown that the law of this creation is not, as of its tributary parts, a mere passive energy necessarily fulfilling its end. Its operation is in the power of an intelligence which is able to say "yes" or "no," to the Creator's will; which can fail of its end, and balk the love of God, because its obedience is voluntary, and it works by a magnificent assent. And when the Divine Idea is fully manifested, and all is love, loving and being loved, what

a source of love to God must be the thought that He made our love of Him, the result of our own free choice! The majority of mankind do not fulfil their end. They abdicate a power which is their life, in yielding themselves to that lower law of necessity which works in the unintelligent creation. They work as slaves, not as sons. They need not do this. Each individual of the species is able to fulfil his end. "Usque ad Brachmani cœlum omnes mundi sunt remeabiles," (Bhagavad-Geta, Ed. F. Schleg. p. 156) says the oldest psychology extant. But, in the exercise of their freedom they refuse, and God cannot compel them. He respects the sovereignty Himself has bestowed. He cannot (as men speak) by reason of His justice, compel the will of the creature He has made free. It would be to deprive those who accomplish His will of the most exquisite bliss of its accomplishment. There is no reason for expecting any variation in the relative proportion of the two classes. There is no future, however distant, at which reason has the least justification for a hope that society will be other than it is. There is that future,—but it is out of the sphere of human reason. To each of us it is capable of being present. Each in his vicarial administration of his law of life can fulfil, in this organic existence, that his end. And that is, not a mere insignificant contribution to a progress which, in the revolution of ages, is to result in a social perfection in which he is to have no concern, but in his present incorporation in a body of many members which is now perfect, although capable of accretion.

We must now break straight off from this part of our subject, leaving untouched a multitude of topics opened up by this work, which flow into the one over which we have thus lightly skimmed. What little space is left us, we must devote to that question of social development which forms the capital, as it were, at the full height of Clarence's philosophy of life.

A Cistercian monk is *not* "the product of all the centuries and half the nations of the world." (p. 203.) His spiritual, any more than his sensible being, is not the spontaneous development of an innate law of corporate and incidentally individual progress. There is no living law by which the inorganic, any more than the organic stature of man, has increased since he first stood a god in the sensible creation. If any thing, the intrinsic tendency

has been all along to degeneracy. F. Schlegel suggests that the injection of carbonic acid gas into the belt of atmosphere that surrounds the earth from 900,000,000 human beings, second by second, for near 6,000 years may have so deteriorated it as to account for the diminution of his longevity and bodily size and vigour. The injury done to the great laboratories of oxygen, the northern latitudes, by their swarming populations, might even add to the mischief. But, if this be fanciful, that the human passions have produced a more fatal effect on the spiritual atmosphere is by no means fanciful. By this time, in regular development, men would have dwarfed to demons. It has required direct interpositions of the Creator to save a few. Clarence reads the word of God in the sensible universe as Protestants do their few pages of incorrect translation of the Christian Bible. He misses the meaning in the details. He is unable to think of a soul as an entire destiny in itself. He cannot distinguish it from from the human entity. He cannot think of a living leaf except as a part of a tree; and so he cannot think of a living soul except as a drop in the ocean of human life. If we read, however, of the soul in the material creation, it is rather the tree than the leaf which intimates the idea. A human soul is a complete creation in itself, more so than the whole organic universe. Neither are science, or the industrial arts, (as they are called) nor even society indispensable for the fulfilment of its end. Otherwise the souls of the multitudes of infants which disappear from the bosom of their mothers would be a mere waste of life, and the unlearned would be scarcely distinguishable from the brutes. Of all objective existencies, the completest is the human soul. All the rest of creation has its completness in it. Its completeness is in God. Where, in the sensible creation, will you look for an analogy of this most Utopian theory of social development? For our part, we can find nothing like it. All nature cries out against it. The growth and decay of individuals, we see indeed everywhere. But the whole remains pretty much as it was from the first. Clarence, in his dead adhesion to nature, does the extremest violence to it. Refusing all cognizance of the supra-sensible, he assigns to the human being a position in sensible existence, which there is nothing whatever in it to justify. He invents a law who refuses to recognize any which cannot

be proved from nature. An induction cœval and co-extensive with mankind he throws upon human imbecility, because it has transgressed the laws of the organic universe. But those very laws he himself utterly disregards and contradicts at the bidding of a mere gratuitous and arbitrary conjecture.

"No fact, it must be admitted, is more certain than that our passions do lord it over the reason, making increase of knowledge and ability subservient to them. But there is another fact, less ostensible, but equally certain, that increase of knowledge brings with it new desires, or tames the old; and men's very passions, their tastes, wishes, desires, grow to be more reasonable—grow to be such as, by their very gratification, promote the good of the whole, and the more permanent and complete good of the man himself." —p. 31.

"In this or that individual man, the victory between Passion and Reason may be doubtful. In Humanity, as it lives from age to age, the final victory is not so doubtful. Slowly and surely the Intelligence modifies the passion to itself."—p. 31.

Here is the key stone of Clarence's philosophy. And this potent knowledge which is to effect these distant wonders,—which is to do what the Christian revelation is unequal to—is science, mere material science. Clarence admits of no other. His own psychology is nothing more.

Is it possible that such a mind can have brought itself to believe that it is satisfied with such a conclusion? Thorndale has his misgivings. He says, "it is easy to despond (which is a mistake however) and if the progress you wish to believe in must be rapid, I have nothing but despondency to offer you." (p. 30.) But when Clarence comes to his confession of faith, he speaks of this far off castle in the air with all the enthusiasm of an assured belief.

Seckendorf would never have let this pass. It is true that knowledge does slowly and surely modify human passion to itself. But not in the direction of progress. It is only by inviting it to an intenser, more refined, and more fatal indulgence! In this or that individual, the victory between passion and reason is, if any where, doubtful. In humanity, as it lives from age to age, never. In the latter, passion always triumphs at last. If there be aught in the least resembling an exception, it is that of rare individual cases. But, mostly, they only seem to be

such. A subtler passion has triumphed in place of a ruder; Julian instead of Maximin.

The place where, if anywhere, we should detect some intimations, however faint, of this probable success of reason in the end, would be in human governments. Their testimony is all the other way. They are reason's best efforts. Yet what are they when we look into them? Compacts of self-interest! Nothing else! Nothing else, that is to say, for all that concerns reason's part in them. They have another meaning, which we have only space just to hint at, in a very brief digression. Taking their rise in the tradition of a religious sentiment, they have all along discharged, and do still, discharge the office of heralds of a higher worship, and a nobler restraint. To each individual they have performed the part of raising the subjective consciousness to a higher objectivity. The form is nothing. Emperors, or "the law," have developed the emotions of awe and love, combined in loyalty, as a preparation for that charity which the revelation of the Divine Nature has made known to be the perfection of the human. Human institutions, springing thus remotely from a divine source, are the precursors of divine. The most loyal nations thus have always been the most religious. For a similar reason peoples are less religious under democratical forms of government. This country merited the title of the "Isle of Saints," under her real monarchs. Under her constitutional hotch-potch, she has lapsed into a semi-infidelity. Belgium, Piedmont, are other cases in point. Indeed, the very word which expressed the lower loyalty, expressed too, the higher. A man was religious ad imperatores as well as ad Deos. Clarence's political theory is exactly the reverse. He is very shallow on this topic; quite unreasonable. With him, a divine government is a gratuitous extravagance imagined out of human governments. His god is an imaginary king. Men invented a divine prestige to succour the instability of human sovereignty. The fear of punishment has no deeper source than "the terrors which men fling abroad in the name of The Deity, in distrust of one another." He calls the "vision of hell, that great and salutary terror, which more than all other causes put together, is supposed to secure the peace and order of the world." (p. 20). We cannot fall in with this notion of human imbecility. The principle of evil is more formida-

ble than this. Society is not held together by a threat. Human passion, which braves hell, is not such a goose as to fly from a scare-crow. In trying to underrate the force of evil, Clarence exaggerates the power of a cowardly and causeless fear. Even where the innate emotions have, in a renewal of the Divine Image, been quickened to faith, a terror so distant has not been able to secure the well being of society. Every mortal sin a Catholic commits, is at the admitted risk of hell. Always it has been found indispensable, in human governments, to bring the punishment nearer home. The human being, with his own hands, presents the instrument with which he is to be struck. By his own free act and deed, he vindicates God's justice in the terrific sanctions of His law, even whilst, with Clarence, he resents their assertion as inconsistent with his nature, and describes them as a mere bugbear invented by "simpletons" to scare children. We have too much veneration for the majesty of law to enthrone it on a sham. A "great and salutary terror," if it had no deep inner truth in the human consciousness to appeal to, would be no terror at all. And this brings us back to the point from which we digressed.

All human governments, in so far as they are the products of reason, are mere extemporized expedients against the tyranny of passion. They rest on the admission that passion is stronger than reason. A sense of common danger raises up a common consent as a barrier against the individual selfishness. Be the particular form what it may of that indispensable encroachment on human liberty which men call government, the very end and cause of its existence is, because passion and reason must 'settle their differences' in the public ring, and the latter is invariably overweighted. In weighing one against the other, poor reason inevitably kicks the beam, and men, in sheer terror, throw in a lump of their own liberty to trim the scales. Clarence does not dissent from this. "It is precisely," he says, "the most reasonable thing that, in human affairs, it is the most preposterous to expect." (p. 30.) "But," he continues, "it is easy to despond. And if the progress you wish to believe in must be rapid, I have nothing but despondency to offer you." Still further on, however, where there is no glimmer of a light, where, indeed, it would be too far distant to be discernible if there were, he points to the most wild conjecture rather

than to a hope. He who resents revelation, because reason, which is limited, cannot comprehend its whole, which is infinite, commits himself to a conclusion for which reason does not supply a single premiss. He rejects a faith which contradicts no science for one which contradicts all. His very incredulity is a grovelling superstition. "There is no appeal," he says, "beyond the reason, the knowledge of the man." And forthwith he proceeds to appease the cravings of his consciousness, and to hold down those strong heart-beatings of his immortality by an hypothesis for which not only does knowledge not afford him one single ground or precedent, but which is a flat contradiction to all the past and present of the human race. And he does it with his eyes open. He is no somnambulist. He walks into the dark with as full a consciousness as if he were walking into the light. "No fact, it must be admitted," they are his own words, "is more certain than that our passions do lord it over the reason, making increased knowledge and ability subservient to them." (p. 31.) Yet, in direct contradiction of this, he argues in the very next sentence, "that increase of knowledge brings with it new desires, or tames the old." How knowledge may modify passions we have already more than hinted, if our space forbade our explaining it very fully. But this flat contradiction of propositions it is wholly out of our power to reconcile. His single illustration is the passion of revenge in civilized countries, with the same passion amongst savages. (p. 31.) Did we admit the illustration, it would only amount to a support of our view of the *modification* of the passions by reason. But we do not. Do the Christian martyrologies testify to this humanizing effect of reason? Or was Rome in the time of the Cæsars not a civilized country? To take a case from our own times. We do not see how savages could exceed the barbarity of blowing hecatombs of human beings from the mouths of cannons, having previously made them perform an act which, by their religious belief, robbed them of their hope of future blessedness. Yet Clarence will not say that England is uncivilized. Would he, in other respects, adduce pagan Rome in her utmost height of splendour and civilization as an example of old passions tamed by reason? Or shall it be Athens? There, at least, mere human intelligence rose to its utmost height. In the development of æsthetic beauty, in efforts of pure

reason, England is far behind her. Yet the whole history of her political decadence exhibits an example of passion exasperated, not tamed by reason. In vice, as in philosophy, eloquence, letters, and the arts, she kept her supremacy. Amidst the obscenities and meannesses of their countrymen and countrywomen, which Juvenal and Persius scourged unmercifully, they award the palm of immorality to the city of Pericles and Plato.

> "Quæ nunc divitibus gens acceptissima nostris,
> Et quos præcipue fugiam, properabo fateri,
> Nec pudor obstabit. Non possum ferre, Quirites
> Græcam urbem: . . . . . ."

Shall we be referred to China, which was the oldest monarchy on the earth, and was acquainted with the art of printing when our ancestors painted their skins, which is full of civilization, and where material prosperity and pure reason have had an unusually favourable experiment?

Or shall it be to France, the most highly civilized nation on the globe, in an age specially dedicated to the worship of reason? Or, in short, coming nearer home, shall it be to contemporary England? Whereabouts within her shall we look for these hopeful symptoms of "passions tamed by reason?" Shall it be to those Portias —not one, but numbers of them—murdering their offspring for a shilling or two burial fees? Shall it be to a succession of beings, of which Rush, Tawell, Palmer, and Dove, are only samples? Shall it be to her rural population, not much removed above the brutes? Or to her manufacturing population, sunk in degrading vice? Or to the commercial classes, from which the unscrupulous self-seeking of reasoning avarice has banished all honour and integrity? Or to the aristocracy, whose delineation we leave to Thorndale's too faithfully powerful pencil? Or to the public tone and temper of the nation as exhibited in the *Times* newspaper; to its impassive indifference to truth; its suppression of facts that tell another way than its own, where that is possible, its distortion of them where it is not; its habit of blackening the character of those, however eminent for worth or dignified by station, to whom it is opposed, and detracting from the merit of deeds it cannot conceal; its barbarous abuse of its enemies, and gasconades of rage, boasting, and

revenge; its flashy, inconsequential writing, are they the indications of the *refining* power of civilization, (so-called) and of passions tamed by reason?

We know of cases of officers and men burning and robbing houses, and shooting inoffensive Chinese gentlemen for a spree, and relating these feats unrebuked in English society, with all the unction imaginable. We know too of a Catholic officer being compelled to knock down his men with the butt end of his musket, to stay their shooting Chinese struggling for life in the water. Could any savages do worse? That brutal insensibility to another life which goes by the name of courage—is that the new virtue which advancing reason eliminates, and which is to compensate for all these barbarities?

The truth is, the intuition—the seat of the affections—is essentially stronger than reason. Reason is an attribute of the imperfection of mankind. It is the digger and delver for the spirit of man, its hewer of stones and drawer of water. Thought is not, as Thorndale has it, either "a luxury or a triumph," but a toil and a penance, the same as bodily labour. Like it, it is voluntary and responsible. It is the toil of ignorance. It is the knowledge that there is something it does not know trying to find out what that something is. It is the mind's effort to make up the deficiency of its intense impotence. It is not because man was made to God's image that he reasons, but because he has fallen from it. It is what is left of consciousness trying to grope its way through the present to the future, by the help of memories, useless, nay, pernicious unless guided by intuition. It is the curious child spelling through its first lesson. What men call knowledge is a mere relation, a little more compared with a little less. What has knowledge, absolute knowledge, to do with unassisted reason, but to smile at the busy blunderer, at the grave earnestness of its efforts, and its extravagant appreciation of their success? In the revelation made to us of the nature of the Godhead, it is nowhere said that he is Reason, but that He is Love.

On the other hand we are taught that Reason has a kind of natural incapacity for knowledge. It is expressly stated that the foolish in Reason's estimation form the great bulk of those who have knowledge, of which all, save a few of the wise and learned,—the men of "scientific culture" are destitute. It is in this usurpation of the place

of the affections by reason that it becomes a fool. Clarence edges very near the truth when he argues thus:

"If a society should in its corporate capacity take for its ultimate end mere physical wellbeing, it would not succeed even in that. It must also adopt for its main result the cultivation of the social affections, and the moral and religious feelings of man. Not only because this is the higher end in itself, but because only through this union of mind with mind, in their higher relations, will you obtain that unity of action you desire for mere physical wellbeing."—p. 153.

A few lines further on he thus describes an ideal of that advanced society of his, whose realization seems so impossible for the present, that he looks into an incalculably distant future for the mere possibility of it. "A society where the rule which governs all is made by all, understood and voluntarily obeyed by all" (p. 153). So just a description of Catholic society in its perfection refers us necessarily to the religious orders as an *existing* example of Clarence's remote Utopia, with the single exception of the phrase "*made by-all,*" which even Clarence would admit is not indispensable. And if there be one order which, more than another, answers to this description, we should have selected at once the Society of Jesus as that particular one. Yet, so impossible is it for even the most amiable and gifted mind, whose consciousness is developing outside of the Communion of Saints, to apprehend ever so imperfectly the inner law or acting life of that sublime society, that this writer actually instances the Jesuit order, coupled with the Paraguay Indians, as an example of the opposite to his Utopia, as indeed "a type of imbecility and weakness." So too he is struck with admiration at the spectacle of men voluntarily giving up all which the rest of mankind prize at least as much as their life. But there would appear to be an incapacity for a nobler vision than "the proud determination of the high contemplative soul to rid itself, at once of all the shackles that want or cupidity would hang about it." This, to Clarence's thinking, is one of the noblest sentiments of individual minds (p. 197). The *humble*, or *self-forgetting*, determination of the *loving* soul to rid itself of all the shackles that riches, or other selfish advantage or indulgence, would hang about it, and so restrain, if not hinder, its commerce with the supreme

object of its love, and to satisfy its intense spiritual emotion by one sublime life-prolonged act of love to men, this is altogether beyond his organic cognizance; and so he sweeps it into the rubbish corner of conjecture, and withholds from it both his admiration and his belief. Nay, unconscious alike of the beautiful and the true, he stands musing upon his refuse heap, admiring human progress, because he has chosen to believe that there was once a time when all there, now so worthless, and even obnoxious, was gold and precious stones. His loftiest conceptions cannot mount higher than the Buddhist gymnosophist. The Catholic saint is in a heaven quite out of his reach. One or two Brahmin contemplatives distinguish a very select and exclusive intellectual aristocracy. But that immense multitude, "which no man could number," of men and women of all climates, countries, and nations; all ranks, dispositions, and mental powers and culture, who, throughout nearly nineteen centuries, have forsaken wealth, rank, literary pursuits, tenderest natural ties, all sensible pleasure, and individual independence, comes before him only in an aspect of "*weakness and imbecility.*" Not that he is quite insensible to the beauty of the life of the Catholic religious. He would choose of all things "to walk into a monastery and end his days there." Only he is bound hands and feet, with the corpse-bands of a foregone conclusion. He looks forward into his cell and concludes before he has tried it, that he would have to "*stop thinking*" in order to remain there. In this gratuitous and most false conjecture he wraps himself round as in a winding sheet, and hugs a monomaniacal persuasion that he is not a living man.

"The angel of goodness stands at his pillow," he writes of a Cistercian monk, "and truth waits for him in the antechamber" (p. 205). "With how sweet a smile," he exclaims, "even on his delusions, will she welcome him, when the life-dream is over!"

How great an advantage has the philosophy of the Church over these meditative guessings of half-desponding reason! It has under its very sight that Utopia—only one of an altogether incalculably sublime description—which poor reason is obliged to postpone to a distance which no rational conjecture ever can reach. The all-embracing bosom of the Mother of Eternal life holds a place on this very planet Tellus, and at the very present

time. It is true that this sensible and organic present, this succession and relation of cause and effect, life and death, sun and cloud, night and day, this error of reason, and hope of fears, will clear away, and leave nothing save the infinitude of its spotless immortality. But, in the meantime, here it is, a living, acting, loving Utopia. No day-dream! a thing that may be touched and handled. You may inspect it, watch it, live in it. Its present actual results are before you. Its citizens are not men of inconceivably distant generations. They are at your side, contemporaries. Even the more than half-blind blunderer, reason, allows that "the angel of goodness stands at their pillow," and that truth is no farther off than their antechamber."

Every human being has the *capacity* of being a citizen therein, at the moment when these words are written. It is admitted that "society forms itself in each man" (p. 62). What then is its irrationality? Is reason true to herself in thus hanging about the threshold, longing, yet refusing to cross? What tolerable arguments can she adduce for being shocked at a science because it is higher than her own? Can she pretend herself to have truth nearer than her antechamber? What if this Utopia have another state of being, higher than this sensible, lower than itself? What if another department of creation be going on somewhere else by another law, no longer probationary, but purgative? This, too, is no distant speculation. It is *present*, although invisible. And where so much is under the senses, although reason never could have discovered the remainder, she ought not to experience a difficulty in believing that it exists, when she is taught by the overwhelming majority of human intellect, illustrated by the out-of-all comparison, noblest human virtue, that it does.

ART. IV.—1. *Lodge's Peerage for* 1858. London: Hurst and Blackett.

2. *Guizot's History of Richard Cromwell and the Restoration.* London: Bentley, 1858.

3. *The English Constitution in the Reign of Charles II.* By Professor Amos. London: Stevens and Norton, 1857.

4. *Guizot's History of Oliver Cromwell and the English Commonwealth.* London: Bentley, 1858.

5. *The Rise and Progress of the English Constitution.* By Professor Creasy. Third Edition, 1858; London: Bentley.

6. *Horace Walpole's Correspondence.* Edited by Peter Cunningham. London: Bentley.

7. *Memoirs and Correspondence of Charles James Fox.* Edited by Lord J. Russell. London: Bentley.

8. *Memoirs of the Court and Cabinet of George III.* By the Duke of Buckingham. London: Bentley.

9. *Lord Mahon's History of England* New Edition. London: Murray.

10. *Macaulay's History of England from the Reign of James II.* Vols. IV. and V. London, Longman.

THERE are many aspects in which our history may be regarded; and among others, not the least interesting, is that in which it may be regarded as a history of the struggles of the aristocracy for supremacy; that is to say, as well their intestine struggles among themselves, as their contests as a body, whether with the Church, the monarchy, or the people. Those who have not regarded our history with reference to this special view, will hardly conceive the tenacity and continuity of these struggles in the contests for supremacy; which, when attention is awakened to them, are seen to form a chief feature in our national story. For, after all, our sovereigns have had comparatively a feeble influence on our destinies as a nation. Few of them have been of such commanding character as to mould the aristocracy to their will, and it was not until the body were weakened by their own intestine contests, that they fell under the yoke of the monarchy. And then no long

time elapsed ere they took a terrible revenge and expelled the dynasty which threatened their supremacy.

That period of our history which closes with the "Conquest," exhibits the Sainted Edward weakly contending with the imperious Godwin; and perhaps that terrible event itself was as much the result of the ambitious intrigues, as of the personal interests and views of the Saxon aristocracy. The Conqueror's Norman chivalry were too much engaged during his reign in planting their yoke on the necks of the enslaved nation, to quarrel either among themselves or with the remnant. But so early as the reign of Stephen we see fierce struggles between the partizans and rival claimants of the crown very much resembling the sanguinary wars of the Roses. And from the accession of John to the reign of Edward I., there was one continued contest between the nobility and the monarchy. It was this which extorted the "Great Charters" which are, with (as Professor Creasy satirically observes) too often ignorant admiration, regarded as the sources of our liberties. Very little, as the student of them knows, had they to do with what *we* call our liberties. The charters were extorted by the nobles, not for the nation, but for themselves. They themselves were the worst oppressors of the people, who could only be protected by the power of the Crown, whose criminal power was exercised chiefly by the "Justiciary." Partly to give it greater weight, and partly because few but churchmen were qualified to exercise such high authority, the office of Justiciary was often joined to that of Chancellor, and to the dignity of Apostolic Legate. So weak already was the power of the Crown and of the Church, that even this union of the highest civil and ecclesiastical authority did not protect the exalted personage who exercised it against the intrigues or the revenge of the barbarous nobles, whose tyranny it was designed to restrain. Thus St. Thomas of Canterbury, in a great degree, fell a sacrifice to the hostility he had provoked by the vigour with which he had curbed the cruelty of the nobles. So we read in Roger of Wendover, not long after, similar complaints, no doubt equally false, of another Papal Legate who exercised the office of Justiciary, so obnoxious to an unruly aristocracy. It is made a complaint of this prelate that he used to travel with an array of 1500 attendants, and surrounded by a troop of soldiers. But those

who read the chronicles of that age will know that there was great need of such protection, or else one of those "human kites" of whom they speak, would think nothing of rushing out of his den and carrying off the King's Justiciary and all his clerks, at "one fell swoop." This was actually *done* in some cases.

Professor Creasy says truly enough, that it is impossible to understand Magna Charta without a consideration of contemporary history; and his own historical introduction, though remarkable for ability, is far from adequate, from a want of sufficient attention to the contemporary chronicles, which afford the only true commentary upon the Great Charter, and abundantly prove that its object, so far as the barons were concerned, was not so much to gain liberation from royal tyranny, as to claim immunity for their own. For this reason the Holy See, which was, and ever has been hostile to any tyranny, soon held it as necessary to resist the barons, as it had deemed it at first necessary to resist the monarchy. It is a huge fallacy, countenanced by most writers, and among others by Professor Creasy, that the only tyranny in that age was the tyranny of the king; we grant that John was a ruffian and a tyrant, but we say that the barons were for the most part as bad, and that a hundred tyrants are, for the mass of the people, infinitely worse than one. And the plain truth is, that the barons made John's tyranny a pretext for establishing their own. Let us see.

What the tyranny of the nobles was in the age immediately preceding that of the Great Charter it is necessary to know, in order rightly to appreciate that event; and a true picture of it may be seen in the contemporary chronicles. "There were (says William of Malmsbury) many castles thoughout England, each *defending* their neighbourhood, but, more properly speaking, laying it waste. The garrisons drove off from the fields both sheep and cattle, nor did they abstain either from churches or church-yards. Seizing such of the country vavassours or yeomenry as were reputed to be possessed of money, they compelled them, by extreme torture, to promise whatever they thought fit. They plundered the houses of the wretched husbandmen, even to their very beds; they cast them into prison, and did not liberate them until they had given up everything they possessed, or could by any means scrape together. Many calmly expired in the

midst of torments inflicted to compel them to ransom themselves, bewailing (which was all they could do) their miseries to God." Thus, those castles, with the ruins of which even now England is studded, were so many dreadful dens of robbery and murder. And the proud barons and knights of England were, for the most part, mere brigands, who lived like *banditti* upon plunder extorted by torture. Their knightly retainers were at once the instruments and imitators of their tyranny, and these again, had for their agents, their tenants; the knights holding of the barons; the terre-tenants of the knights; by feudal tenure, the main conditions of which were fealty and military service.

No doubt the king sometimes practised the enormities he sought to restrain among his nobles, and thus it was with John; but it is a trite truth that one tyrant is better than a hundred. Moreover, by the tyranny of the king at the worst, a few nobles and knights suffered; whereas the cruel rapacity of the nobles and their retainers, was every where exercised upon the entire nation. And we can but little sympathize with the barons, when loudly complaining of a tyranny practised by the king, which they themselves so cruelly practised upon the people. The struggle between them and John, which resulted in the Great Charter, was not less marked by their rapacity and cruelty than by his. Here is a passage from ancient Roger: "A party of the barons who were staying at London, made an incursion into the country near Cambridge, pillaged it and took the castle. From thence they marched on, roving through the counties of Norfolk and Suffolk, pillaging the country as well as the churches. They extorted large ransoms from the towns of Yarmouth, Dunwich,* and Ipswich; and then, after collecting booty about Colchester, and ravaging the country there in like manner, they returned to their old haunts at London." This reminds one of Rushworth, and reads like an account of the oppression exercised by the oligarchy who subverted the throne and tyrannized over the nation under the pretence of liberty, in the age of the Long Parliament and the Rebellion.

In other words, the feudal system was a vast net-work

* Long since overwhelmed by the sea.

of domestic tyranny, save only so far as it was crushed and restrained by the power of the Crown and the authority of the Church. The power of the Crown derived its chief weight from the moral sanction and spiritual weapons of the Church; and as these were slighted by the Crown, its own power became weakened, and the nobles encroached upon it, and gave more and more the reins to their barbarous tyranny. Thus we read in William that the Papal Legate excommunicated the offenders; but, adds the chronicler, "of little use was that," unaided by the power of the Crown, which had already taught the nation to scoff at excommunication and deride the mere spiritual weapons of the Church. So again we read in Roger of Wendover, that the Legate of the Apostolic See held a council in the middle of the twelfth century, but "no respect was shown to the Church or its ministers, by the profligate wretches who plundered the country, but every body was laid violent hands on, or ransomed, or kept in prison, just as they pleased whether clerk or layman." The Church did its best, and at this council it was declared that "rustics at the plough should be sacred, as if in a church yard," and the wretches who oppressed the country were excommunicated: and so, says the chronicler, "the rapacity of these *human kites* was a *little* checked." Suppressed it could not be, save by a strong hand. Hence the celebrated clause in Magna Charta that the freeholders should not be deprived of their tenements, except by a legal judgment, or by the ordinary course of law, which, as the framers of the charter well knew, would be, as against their power, purely nugatory. And the phrase which (from unacquaintance with the chronicles) has sorely puzzled the commentators on the charter, "nec super eum ibimus nec super eum mittemus," meant that the king's justiciary could not exercise summary jurisdiction upon a freeholder by "coming upon him" with an armed force to arrest him; (the only way of exercising any effectual control over the fierce retainers of the barons and knights); but that the arrest should be left to the constable, by warrant from the sheriff. Fancy a parish constable going to arrest a Bigod, carousing and lurking in his castle amidst a host of feudal retainers! The poor man would in five minutes be dangling over the castle walls; nor would the sheriff fare much better.

The ordinary power of the Crown was in the sheriff,

whose ultimate resource was the "*posse comitatûs*," the chief offender possibly being Lord Paramount of the county, and having under his control all the "men at arms" in it. So that the sole effective power to repress the outrages of the barons' retainers, the freeholders, was restrained by this article in the Charter. No doubt it also restrained the tyrannical exercise of power on the part of the Crown, and that was the motive with which the prelates supported it; but subsequent events showed that the barons made the tyranny of the Crown only a pretence to obtain impunity for their own. And in the Charter of Henry III., it is remarkable, that the clause restraining arrest, except by ordinary course of law, is confined in its operation to the Crown; and it does not at all restrain the nobles.

This we shall find the characteristic of all the boasted guarantees for liberty gained by the nobles. The history of subsequent events, shows that the barons designed far more than protection from royal tyranny, and sought, under cover of the Charter, to aggrandize their own power. This is indeed apparent from the concluding part of it, to which curiously enough Professor Creasy does not seem to have given his attention. We mean the clause providing that a permanent council of the barons should determine whenever there was at any future time, in their opinion, a violation of Charter on the part of the Crown, and should in the event of such being their opinion, levy civil war against their sovereign to coerce him into governing in conformity with their judgment. It is extraordinary that that which virtually amounted to a destruction of the monarchy, should not have attracted more attention from commentators upon the Great Charter, especially as it is omitted in all subsequent confirmations of the Charter. There can be little doubt that this alteration in the constitution, by changing a monarchy into an oligarchy, was the real object of the barons, for they attempted it again and again at subsequent periods, —as for example, under Henry III., when they were led on by Simon de Montfort, but foiled by the resolution of Edward. It is curious to observe how the struggle was renewed at successive periods in our history.

Writers on "the British Constitution," especially with reference to the House of Commons, point to its origin in the reign of Henry III., just after the era of the

Great Charter. But that was merely another movement of the aristocracy to aggrandize their own power, and had no popular element in it, any more than the "settlement" of the Rebellion or the Revolution. When Simon de Montfort managed to have a second legislative assembly convened, in which sat the "Knights,"—it was anything but a "House of Commons." It was merely an assembly of the retainers of the barons, designed to assist them in controlling the Crown. It had in it, by the aid of the feudal system, the germ of that "settlement" which, at the Revolution, practically gave supreme power to the aristocracy, as we shall soon see.

In the reign of Edward I., the power of the nobles was restrained by an iron arm; but in that of his successor, they easily encroached upon the Crown, and made the "parliaments" the means of doing so. Under pretence of attending parliament, they came surrounded by hosts of armed retainers, who overawed the king and compelled him to submit to "ordinances" which they imposed, and which, like the Charters, restrained in the Crown alleged violations of liberty which they committed without restraint themselves. These "ordinances" of the reign of Edward II., remind one remarkably of the "ordinances" of the aristocratic conspirators under Charles I.; and the murder of Spenser bears a striking resemblance to the murder of Strafford. In both cases we see an arrogant aristocracy encroaching on the prerogatives of the Crown, and practically assuming sovereign power. Parliaments were but assemblies of their creatures, and meetings of their armed retainers. And of the "ordinances" which were passed by terror of military force, those which were at all beneficial were so only as regarded the power of the Crown; and for the most part they did but practically give a usurped sovereignty to the nobles.

It was in this reign that the seeds were sown of that division of the aristocracy into two rival factions which, though restrained under Edward III., were revived under his weak successor Richard II., and resulted ultimately in those fatal wars of the Roses, which, for a century, prostrated the aristocracy and invested the Crown with absolute authority. We believe the reigns of Edward II. and Richard II., are much misunderstood through want of attention to this as the key and clue to their history,—the unceasing struggle between the monarchy and

the aristocracy for supremacy. Much that is imputed to the arbitrariness of the monarchs, ought rather to be ascribed to the ambition of the nobles. There can be no doubt that both those kings had, during all their reigns, to struggle against confederacies to dethrone them, or destroy their power, and that they both fell victims to the conspiracies of their nobles, who inflicted upon the people, without remorse, the tyranny they imputed to the Sovereign or his "favourite." The very phrase "favourite," implies the evil feeling of envy and jealousy in which its use arose. The fact is, that the king chose the baron whom he deemed most faithful in his service, as his minister; and this rendered others jealous and envious, and hence confederacies and conspiracies to supplant him. This was the source of the intrigues of Lancaster under Edward II., and of Gloucester under Richard II. Speaking of the latter, Dr. Lingard truly said, "he assumed the ascendancy, fomented the discontent of the nobility, new modelled the government, and left to Richard little more than the empty name of king." And again: "the opportunity was seized by the great barons, under the guidance of Gloucester, to plot among themselves the overthrow of the administration." This might be taken (as we showed in our last) for a description of the origin of the Rebellion under Charles I. "They contended that the commons, by continual taxation, had been impoverished; that the higher classes could not procure payment of their rents, and that the tenants were, in many places, compelled to abandon their farms through distress." Precisely the pretended charges at the era of the Rebellion. "How far," observes the historian, "these evils were chargeable on the *administration*, it is impossible to ascertain." But in this we venture to differ. The amounts received by the Sovereign from taxation were ascertainable, or at least the proportions which these bore to the national wealth; and the historian himself adds that Richard actually relinquished some of the subsidies which were granted to him. It is beyond a doubt that the amount of taxation could not have "impoverished" the "commonalty," and still less the tenantry. What had far more to do with these evils (so far as they existed at all, and doubtless they were exaggerated) was the oppression exercised by the nobles themselves. And we regret that it did not occur to the venerable historian to remem-

ber the statutes in which their exactions, even on religious houses, are vainly reprobated; and to recall that saying of the middle age which speaks volumes as to the real causes of the impoverishment of the tenants by the nobles and knights;—"it is better to live under the crozier than under the lance." It was not the Crown only, nor chiefly, which was the source of oppression to the people. It was rather the *nobles*. And it is curious to observe along the whole course of our history, their constant struggles for their own power under pretence of upholding the freedom of the nation.

Thus the impeachment of Suffolk under Richard II., was exactly the same kind of act as the impeachment of Spenser under Edward II., or of Strafford under Charles I. It was in every instance a mere attempt to supplant a political opponent, in the possession of political power, and to grasp the possession of such power. The case of Suffolk is the first which assumes the form of a regular impeachment, and, as the historian well remarks, deserves to be remembered by posterity; but for a reason which he does not give, viz., that it was the origin of a proceeding devised by one aristocratic faction to destroy the leaders of another, under pretence of something like a legal prosecution, but practically in a manner utterly arbitrary. For the pretended "impeachment" would be needless if there had been any real criminality; and hence, as in this instance, the charges have almost always been vague and visionary, amounting in reality to no more than this, that the accused had become an object of envy and jealousy. In the first instance which occurred, the parliament being Catholic, and having some conscience, the accused was acquitted; and the historian truly observes that, "the result seems to show that the administration of Richard had not been so arbitrary and oppressive as we might otherwise have been led to suppose."

"But now the objects of the party in opposition to the court more clearly unfolded themselves, and it was proposed to imitate the precedents of the reigns of John, Henry III., and Edward II., by establishing a *permanent* council, with power to *reform* the state of the nation." Exactly the course taken by the leaders of the Rebellion in the Long Parliament. It practically amounted to a usurpation of the sovereignty by a body of the aristocracy,

and to a deposition of the king, who, so regarding it, refused to sign, and was only compelled to do so by menaces to his life. Under this terror he was forced to sign a commission to a few peers and other dignitaries, appointing them a *permanent* council, to enquire into the officers of his household, courts of law, and every part of the kingdom, into the accounts of the treasury, and the alleged grievances of the people, to hear and determine complaints, which could not be redressed by common course of law, and to provide such remedies for all abuses as should appear to *them* good; a practical assumption of sovereign power; a virtual deposition of the sovereign; a complete subversion of the constitution; and as it was effected by actual threats of murder or deposition to the king, an undoubted treason in all who were concerned in it.

It is strange that this does not seem to have struck any of our historians as a Revolution, a complete subversion of the throne and establishment of an oligarchy. That it was an atrocious tyranny is clear from the cruel fate of the four knights, who were by Gloucester ordered to be hung, for no other offence than the endeavouring to enable their sovereign to recover his lawful royal authority. The whole tragedy of the Rebellion was rehearsed on this occasion, and as we have shown, it was also in effect a rehearsal of the Revolution; which was as much as the treason of Gloucester under Richard, the conspiracy of an oligarchy.

So far from the nobles being champions of freedom, they were on every occasion servile to the sovereign when he was in the ascendant; and then their wretched jealousies found vent in the treacherous betrayal of each other. Thus, when Richard had acquired power, the readiness with which the barons sacrificed each other is as despicable as the eagerness with which they deserted their sovereign on the occasion of the usurper. The struggle was the same as it had ever been—a struggle as to who should play the tyrant. The usurper, Henry of Lancaster, was the nobleman who, as Earl of Derby, had been one of those who virtually seized sovereign power, in confederation with Gloucester. He now aspired to the throne, and seized it, and became a greater tyrant than any of his predecessors. The wars of the Roses, which resulted from this usurpation, were but a sanguinary renewal of the old

struggle of our aristocracy for sovereignty, and by prostrating their strength it paved the way for the tyranny of the Tudors and the Stuarts. The reaction from it was the renewal of the same struggle in the great Rebellion, which we proved in a former paper, to have been really the struggle of an oligarchy.

The spirit in which the English nobles regarded their country, merely as the arena for their selfish ambition, and were as ready to sacrifice to it alike their sovereign or their fellow-countrymen, may be aptly described in the words which our immortal dramatist has put into the mouth of Bolingbroke. He threatens that if his demands are not complied with, he

> "Will lay the summer dust with showers of blood,
> Rained from the wounds of slaughtered Englishmen."

And haughtily affects to lament that

> "——— such crimson tempests should bedrench
> The fresh green lap of fair King Richard's land."

The whole of the historical plays of Shakspeare in truth are striking and terrible pictures of the fierce pride and ambition of our nobility, until we see them enslaved to the tyranny of the Tudors.

The same spirit was shown at the Rebellion as in the wars of the Roses; witness such atrocities as the murder of Strafford and of Laud; of the two Hothams; of Sir George Lisle, and a host of others, slain in cold blood, by a faction which, in its origin, was essentially aristocratic.

The same spirit was displayed before and at the Revolution: witness the ferocity with which Danby was pursued by his antagonists; witness the savage thirst for blood which marked the triumph of the Whigs under William; for controlling which Lord Macaulay takes such credit to his hero. Had the leaders of the faction been allowed to gratify their vengeance, they would have made victims of the most able of their opponents.

They rivetted their yoke upon the people by force of arms. The number of troops, says Mr. Hallam, for which a vote was annually demanded after some variations in the first year of George I., was during the whole administration of Sir R. Walpole (1720-1740) *except* when the state of Europe excited apprehensions of disturbance (so that it was the ordinary military establishment for

home service) rather more than 17000 soldiers, independent of those in the Irish establishment, and including only the foreign forces. And this continued, with little alteration, to be our standing army in time of peace, during the eighteenth century. Mr. Hallam goes on to say, that the army was always understood to be kept on foot, as it is still expressed in the preamble of every mutiny bill, "for the better preserving the balance of power in Europe." "The Commons," he says, "would not admit that it was necessary as a *permanent force in order to maintain the Government at home.*" There can be no question, however, (he adds) that the *court saw its advantage in this light.* "And I am not sure," he observes, with not quite so much candour as shrewdness, "that some of the multiplied negotiations on the Continent in that age, were not intended as a pretext for keeping up the army." In fact, he says, there would have been rebellions in the time of George I., not only in Scotland, but in many parts of the kingdom, had it not been for the standing army. Who can doubt it? In 1722, there was a widely ramified conspiracy for rebellion in England. Several peers were implicated, and among others mentioned, not only Sunderland and North, but *Earl Cowper.* The reader cannot need to be reminded, says Mr. Hallam, that our army existed before the Civil War; and that the guards in the reign of Charles II. were about 5000 men, to which we will add that the army employed by James to suppress an actual insurrection, was not much larger. How is it possible to resist the conclusion that the new dynasty and the new system of government, were practically imposed upon the country by military force? The very excuse for a standing army was the plea of necessity, on account of the danger of rebellion. This disposition to rebellion existed in the country until the middle of the eighteenth century, and Walpole just lived to see the death of Shippen the last Jacobite (as he called him) of any "sensible activity." Two or three generations had to pass away, and not less than the reigns of four Sovereigns, before the nation was reconciled to the new dynasty, and they at first refused to be subdued to it by force of arms, or by the terrors of the law of treason, most arbitrarily fermented and cruelly enforced.

If mere severity in the execution of the law were a valid ground of resistance to a legitimate and native

sovereign, would not barefaced *perversions* of the law afford excuses as valid, for rebellion against an illegitimate, arbitrary, and foreign sovereign? It is of no avail to appeal to the Revolution, or the act of settlement; for the whole scope of these articles, supported by the whig historians, here constantly appealed to, has been, and is, to show that these measures were imposed on the nation by an aristocratic faction, through the means of fraud and force. Lord Mahon says, "no one has ever ventured to assert that these condemnations were legally unjust," in which we venture to differ from him. Smollett wrote in 1758, and he did not scruple to allege that the law was perverted under William; and Lord Mahon himself shows it was so under George. Moreover, the objection we have taken goes to the root of the legality of these trials, even assuming that the judicial proceedings per se were fair and lawful. For, if a small faction, by force of arms, procure an act of parliament and impose a foreign ruler on a nation, can they legally invoke the terrors of the law of treason against those who adhere to their ancient, lawful, and rightful sovereign?

No doubt the Rebellion was a movement of the aristocracy. The Revolution was the conspiracy of an oligarchy. One curious illustration of this is afforded by the Genealogies of the Peerage. The same great families rule now, as at the end of the revolution.

For example, Shaftesbury's patronage founded the family of the *Cowpers*. Sir W. Cowper had been his associate in his vile intrigues to exclude a Catholic sovereign; and his son lived to be Lord Chancellor under George I., and to pass sentence on the "rebel lords" convicted before the House of Lords of high treason, for seeking to restore the heir of the sovereign who had been so excluded.

Nor was this a solitary instance of the great whig families finding political, though not lineal representatives in the great personages who inaugurated the House of Hanover.

There was an intimate of Marlborough, whose name was destined to become ultimately as eminent as that of Pitt in the annals of politics, and a link still more closely connecting our own times with those of Queen Anne; and a yet more remarkable instance of the transmission of political power in "family line." We mean,

of course, Stephen Fox, a name almost as unfortunately associated with ideas of personal and political profligacy as any that lent infamy to the era of the Reformation. The first Fox was one of the leading Revolutionists and the friend of Churchill. Curiously enough, he had held under Charles II. the office of paymaster of the forces, which his descendant filled a century afterwards; and he resembled his descendant and imitated his friend; for he was a defaulter. This son, however, was the first Lord Holland, who became a colleague of Walpole's, and who was the father of the illustrious *Charles James*, whose political battles with Pitt disturbed the long reign of George III.

There is another name which still more closely and strikingly connects the age of Queen Anne, and even times far more distant, with our own,—the name of Fitzwilliam. Among the adherents of Walpole (and one who filled a mean office under him) was Lord Fitzwilliam. His ancestor had been a retainer of Wolsey, his son married the representative of the illfated Wentworth, Earl of Strafford. His descendants, all through the age of the Third George, staunch adherents of Fox, and opponents of Pitt, were ever distinguished as Whigs of the "old school." One of them, Marquis of Rockingham, gave his name to one of the numerous administrations formed under that monarch, and has gained a more illustrious distinction as the friend and patron of Edmund Burke. What a strange interest attaches to a family of which the history unites the age of Wolsey with the times of Walpole, and blends the sad memories of Wentworth and the great Rebellion, with the brilliant reminiscences of the Regency!

If it be true that Walpole was a descendant of Cecil, and that his wife's family were ancestors of the House of Wortley, then there was a curious ancestral connection between Lord Burleigh and Lord Bute; and certainly between the astute and unscrupulous Cecil, and the shrewd and sagacious Walpole, there was considerable political resemblance.

Churchill, Duke of Marlborough, whom we have seen so indignantly held up to reprobation by Mr. Ward, a modern whig, as a scoundrel, was now about to leave the stage, but a certain *Grenville* who had been one of his adherents, was ere long to come into office, and

make the name illustrious in the political annals of the three first Georges. The son-in-law of Marlborough, Spenser, second Earl of Sunderland, seemed to imitate his father's unprincipled intrigues for power, though his infamy excluded him from the regency, and eventually from the ministry. He had a colleague however in Stanhope, who was more respectable; Halifax, son of Montague, the old enemy of Danby, was a man more resembling Shaftesbury.

The memory of Spenser, Earl of Sunderland, is loaded with infamy for his treachery to his Sovereign at the Revolution. He died before the reign of William closed, and his son served in the reign of Anne under Marlborough, both in a military and political capacity. Somehow or other, she learnt to distrust him as she did Churchill, and he was unemployed during her latter years. In the anticipation of her death, his intrigues for power with her successor were incessant, and he contrived to seduce Stanhope (a far nobler nature) to become his associate. It appears however, that George II. had, for some time, a distrust of him, and it was not until after some few years that he succeeded in displacing Townshend as Secretary of State, and soon after his coadjutor Stanhope as Prime Minister. Two or three years however had not elapsed before the Great South Sea Bubble burst, and Sunderland, who had been mixed up in it, was destroyed. His political and natural life soon came to an end, and his short shameful reign was replaced by the long and successful administration of Walpole.

Godolphin had died, but had left two political representatives who rose to power under George I., and were destined to supplant all rivals (and one of whom was ultimately to supplant the other, and to reign without a rival) under George II., both families transmitting even their political power to their representatives; one of these was Townshend the other Walpole. Both of them had been employed by Godolphin under Anne. "An early and intimate connection had been formed (says Coxe) between Townshend and Walpole; they were distantly related, neighbours in the same county, and educated at the same school; they joined the same party, acted under the same leaders, and co-operated in the same opposition. The marriage which Townshend had contracted with Dorothy Walpole in 1713, drew closer the

bonds of amity, and added an union of blood to the connections of party." We quote the passage because the latter lines contain the history of all "the great families," and the origin of that system of political power which has existed ever since. For example, Townshend married into the House of Newcastle, and became thus a natural, not less than political ancestor of the Pelhams, whose "leaden rule," following the long reign of Walpole, was latterly brought into such rough contact with the iron power of Pitt, whose great son rendered illustrious the latter part of the reign of George III., so that thus by two or three successors political power was transmitted from Godolphin through Pelham and Chatham, to an age we may call our own.

The great link in the chain transmitting political power from the age of Queen Anne, to the times of Queen Victoria, was undoubtedly that of Walpole, who came into office greatly through the influence of his brother-in-law Townshend, but whose superior political sagacity, and more shrewd energy, ultimately enabled him to supplant his kinsman, and to reign without a rival for twenty years. His administration was the consolidation of the system settled at the Revolution, but which was not secured until he had completed his work, a work of systematic political *corruption*. To understand his system, which was carried on under the two first Georges, and continued under the third, let us look a little more closely at his political contemporaries, especially those ranged around him, either in making an enmity or an alliance; and all that we have to say will naturally be comprised within the history of the Walpoles, Robert and Horace, reaching as it does from the English Revolution to that of France; from the age of Bolingbroke to that of Burke. The real history of the family begins and ends with the life of *Horace*, who, although he had no political power, has, in his Memoirs and Letters, left the best materials for political annals, and whose lengthened life of nearly eighty years, from 1716 to 1796, embraced that long era in our history, in which "our present constitution" was firmly planted and developed.

At last corruption replaced force. And it was the boast of the long administration of Walpole, that it laid deep in corruption the basis of a firm system of government by means of the measures of the aristocracy. Lord Orford, in

his memoirs of the reign of George III. states, that when Fox came into office, in the early part of that reign, he opened a kind of mart for members of parliament, at his own, the Paymaster's office. It is alleged that the lowest bribe for a vote at that time was £200., and that the Secretary of the Treasury afterwards acknowledged that £25,000 had been thus expended in a single morning. Lord Mahon faintly, very faintly, doubts these statements; but his mere opinion stands for nothing against the testimony of a contemporary, especially of a son of Sir R. Walpole. And Lord Mahon acknowledges that Lord Orford's statements "derive some corroboration from the character of Henry Fox, as the least scrupulous of all Sir R. Walpole's pupils." The secret committee on Walpole's administration failed to disclose all its iniquities, such were the obstacles opposed to the investigation, the successful leaders of opposition being as much involved in corrupt practices as the minister they had displaced, and being in secret correspondence and actual collusion with Walpole. Enough, however, was elicited to give an idea of the system, and one striking fact is stated, that £50,000, at the rate of £5000 a year, had been disbursed out of the public money to *bribe journalists and political writers*, while at the same time, organs of independent opinion were suppressed by prosecutions. The enquiries of the committee likewise disclosed that about a million and a half had been disbursed in a "special and secret service" during Walpole's administration. Thus corruption went on hand in hand with oppression to maintain whig government and the Revolution settlement.

The principle of corruption pervaded all the departments of the state, and paved the way for national disasters. In 1758 a general officer, quoted by Lord Mahon, thus wrote: "As to the civil officers appointed for America, most places in the gift of the Crown have been filled with broken members of parliament, of bad, of any principles, of valets de chambre, electioneering scoundrels, and even livery servants! In one word, America has been for many years made the hospital of England." Lord Mahon says truly that this ill choice of such officers deserves to be noted as among the secondary causes of the Revolution which ensued, and which lost us our American colonies. He adds, that even at the present time abuses of this kind have not altogether ceased. Most grossly did it prevail

during the whole of the last century, when even among the great ministers of state it was scarcely possible to find one who was of any principle, or even common morality, and when profligacy was the prevailing character of public men.

Wedderburn, in 1777, wrote thus in a confidential letter quoted by Lord Mahon: "The peculation in every profitable branch of the service, is represented to be enormous, and as usual is attended with a shocking neglect of every comfort of the troops. The hospitals are pest-houses, and the provisions served out are poison, those that are to be bought are sold at the highest prices of a monopoly." Lord Barrington, Secretary at War, next year addressed this statement to the king: "there is not one General in whom his Majesty, the nation, or the army, could place confidence;" and he represented "the dismay which prevailed among all ranks and conditions, arising from an opinion that the administration was not equal to the times, an opinion prevailing, he added, even among the ministers themselves." So William Pitt (the younger) wrote thus: "I cannot find in history any instance of a nation so miserably sacrificed as this has been." He thought that the remedy was the formation of a ministry by his father, and that was a general impression. What was the obstacle? The king's objection. What did that arise from? The resolution of Lord Chatham to be, as his friend Lord Shelbourne said—*Dictator* chosen by the aristocracy.

It was just as it had been some years before. The elder Pitt—a true whig of the Revolution school—wished to rule both Crown and nation absolutely, by what he called the great families, that is, by an oligarchy; and he would allow the sovereign as little political power as the people. The king was to be a mere puppet. Of course the king felt the strongest repugnance to such a system, and felt that it made monarchy a name. He wrote confidentially to Lord North, "No advantage to the country, nor personal danger to myself, can ever make me address myself to Lord Chatham, or to any other branch of the opposition. Honestly, I would rather lose the Crown than bear the ignominy of possessing it under their shackles." Happily for the country Chatham's death spared it the continuance of the struggle; but as it was, the loss of

America was in great degree caused by it. What is the boasted "British Constitution"?

Of course a system of corruption produced a spirit of corrupt and selfish faction. One result of the spirit of faction, generated by the incessant struggle for political power, was the weakening of the national councils, which were paralysed by the dissensions and vacillations of our rule. Lord North was reproached as having lost America, but so early as 1770 he lamented the fatal consequences of these dissensions, and exclaimed, "if there had only been an union of Englishmen in the cause of England!" Lord Mahon observes that, "from the principles at strife in the country this could not be;" as if it were any strife of "principles," and not a mere struggle for place. What said Lord North, about 1780, impartially enough, when he desired to retire, and only remained in office at the wish of his sovereign? Lord Mahon quotes his letter to the king at the close of 1779, in which he states the complaints made to him by Lord Gower, that nothing could be so weak as the government, that nothing was done, that there was no discipline in the state, the army, or the navy; that impending ruin must be the consequence of the present system of government, and that there was no hope in the opposition, which was as *wicked* as the administration was *weak;* and then Lord North confessed that he had for three years been of the same opinion.* Who could be of any other, who reads the history of that age, a miserable compound of imbecility and profligacy?

Party spirit entered into the naval and military services; need we recal the dissension between Admirals Mathews and Lestock, or the cold-blooded cruelty with which Byng was sacrificed, that the imbecile Newcastle might be saved, and that Anson might be made first Lord of the Admiralty? and history has no chapter so replete with infamy as that in which Horace Walpole, in his memoirs of George II., records the black history of this execrable and horrible transaction, and describes the dark machinations with which Hardwicke pursued his victim to death, in order to secure high office for his *son-in-law,* Anson. Then again, need we do more than

* Mahon's Hist. vol. vi., appendix, xlviii.

mention the disgraceful dissensions between Keppell and Palliser, and the disasters that were caused by the fierce party struggles that ensued; how captains refused to serve while Lord Sandwich was at the Admiralty, and how an admiral threw up the command of a fleet at an hour of public peril, rather than serve an administration he desired to embarrass? The loss of America was partly caused, and the miseries of Ireland aggravated and prolonged by the same detestable struggles of party, which inflicted the greatest disasters on America.

No statesman carried this spirit of faction further than Lord Chatham. This was especially displayed in regard to the contest with our revolted colonies. He declared he never would consent to their independence, yet did his utmost to encourage them to resist, and again and again avowed his conviction that they never could be subdued, and at the height of the struggle made his son resign his commission in the army, in order to throw a damp and discredit on the war; and yet after all this, when the ministry proposed an address to the Crown, to recal the fleets and armies from America, and treat for peace, Chatham resisted the motion with the utmost energy; and this was the last appearance in public of one who was honoured as a patriot. Can we wonder that George III., writing to Lord North, should speak contemptuously of "Chatham and his crew," and describe his eloquence as "specious but malignant"?

Let us give a slight sketch of the political changes which took place from the year 1742 to the accession of George III. At the general election of 1741, says Lord Dover, in his Preface to the Memoirs of the reign of George II., immense efforts were made by the opposition to the Walpole administration, to strengthen their phalanx; great sums were spent by their leaders in elections, and an union was effected between the "patriots," headed by Pulteney and the Tories or Jacobites. Sir Robert was driven to resign "upon this step being taken," says Lord Dover, "and perhaps before it. The Duke of Newcastle and Lord Hardwicke, the two most influential members of Walpole's cabinet, entered into communication with Mr. Pulteney and Lord Carteret, with a view of forming a government to the *exclusion* of the tories, and even of part of Mr. Pulteney's own party. The negotiation was successful, but it was so at the expense of the popularity,

reputation, and influence of Pulteney, who never recovered the disgrace of thus deserting his former associates." He "sank into insignificance and an earldom." Let us observe in passing how entirely these things are treated by the political writers of either party, as mere questions of party. The crime of Pulteney is described not as it really was, the playing of a game for power at the peril of the interests of the empire, but his *desertion of his party.* "In consequence of these intrigues (to use Lord Dover's phrase,) Lord Wilmington was sent for, and formed an administration, comprising Lord Leveson Gower and Lord Bathurst, Jacobites,—Lord Carteret, Pelham, the Duke of Newcastle, who, like the Palmerston of our own day, managed to stick to every government for thirty or forty years, and Lord Hardwicke. Lord Wilmington dying soon after, Henry Pelham, brother of the Duke of Newcastle, became First Minister. The new ministry, however, was rent by internal jealousies and dissensions, for Lord Carteret was the king's favourite, and in 1744 the greater part of the Cabinet threatened to resign if Carteret was not dismissed. The king was compelled to yield; and this was the first instance in which a sovereign of the new dynasty endeavoured to choose his own minister; and it ended in the sovereign's defeat, and his subjugation to the domination of the "great families." Lord Carteret and his friends were dismissed, and a coalition was completed, and the government was formed of the heads of the great families of both factions, Whigs and Tories, and even renegade Jacobites, Pelham continuing First Minister, and even Sir John Hinde Cotton, the Jacobite, having office under him.

Although, however, the king had been forced to dismiss Carteret, (now made Earl Grenville) he continued to consult him in private; but in 1746, during the Rebellion, the Cabinet compelled him to admit Pitt into the government, which he had before refused to do, and now did much against his will. Pitt, however, had an inferior office, and the country remained under what Lord Dover calls the "leaden rule" of the Pelhams, until the death of Henry Pelham, in 1754, no material change taking place during those ten years, except in the exclusion of several colleagues by the Pelhams, out of jealousy. The death of Pelham called into existence, says Lord Dover, the latent divisions and hatred of public men, who had

hitherto been acting in concert. Fox and Pitt were obviously the two persons upon whom the power of Pelham must eventually fall. But the intriguing Duke of Newcastle hated, and was jealous of both. He therefore placed Robinson in the House of Commons, as Secretary of State and Leader, and made Legge, (of the family of the Earl of Dartmouth,) Chancellor of the Exchequer, he himself being First Lord of the Treasury, leaving Fox and Pitt in subordinate situations. Fancy men of their gigantic abilities under such an imbecile as Newcastle! This of course could not last. Let Lord Dover tell the sequel. "The incapacity of Robinson soon became so apparent, that a change was inevitable. This was hastened by a temporary coalition between Fox and Pitt, which was occasioned naturally enough by the ill treatment they had both received from the Duke of Newcastle. At length, in 1755, the latter reluctantly consented to admit Fox into the Cabinet. Upon this Pitt again broke with Fox, and went with his friends into opposition. The new government lasted but one session. The Duke of Devonshire, in 1756, was commissioned (having been very active in the previous political negotiations,) to form a new government. Newcastle and Fox were turned out, and Pitt became lord of the ascendant. But the king's aversion to his new ministers was even greater than it had been to his old, and in 1757 he commissioned Lord Waldegrave, (who had been an adherent of Walpole,) to endeavour to form a new government, with the assistance of Newcastle and Fox. In this undertaking he failed, very mainly through the irresolution and jealousies of Newcastle. Thus circumstanced the king was, however unwillingly, compelled to deliver himself up into the hands of Pitt, who now formed an administration, placing himself at the head of it, having Newcastle the First Lord, and Legge as Chancellor of the Exchequer."

What part had the people in all this? Mr. Pitt, it was said, carried the Cabinet by storm. He was forced upon the Crown in the first instance by the great families, who found they could not get on without him, (he was himself connected with the family of Lyttelton,) and he acquired his popularity with the people by the old whig policy of keeping up a war-fever. His administration was deemed glorious because it flattered British pride by violent aggression, but it sowed the seeds of hostility, which

produced bitter fruit; the alliance between our revolting colonies and France, a few years after, secured them victory over the mother country, and inflicted on Great Britain a terrible retribution. When he found that George III. was not disposed to submit blindly to his dictation, and cherished a desire for peace, Pitt took a course as unscrupulous as ever had been pursued by any Whig minister since the Revolution. We use the language of one of the latest, most moderate, and most candid of the historians of that reign,* when we say that, with a view to precipitate a war with *Spain*, and so render peace hopeless, (for Pitt suspected truly the family compact of the house of Bourbon,) he imperiously demanded terms "injudicious and immoderate," and then at a time when he had received a dispatch from our ambassador which contained nothing which could justify any hostile intentions against Spain, but afforded ample room to hope for an adjustment of differences, Pitt, all of a sudden, imperiously required the king and the Cabinet to consent to warlike operations against Spain! They refused, and he resigned, throwing himself upon the people, whose passions he was aware he had roused to the highest possible pitch in favour of a war, for which there was not any just reason, and all to preserve his political supremacy! What course could be more wicked? Yet the elder Pitt is deemed an heroic patriot! Mr. Adolphus distinctly says that "Mr. Pitt possessed no information which could justify him in declaring war." Yet into that war he wished to bring his king and country to preserve himself in power. He was thus repeating the political dishonesty committed both by Walpole and his opponents, in precipitating a war with Spain which they knew to be unjust.

How does Mr. Adolphus describe the events which ensued? "Since the retreat of Mr. Pitt the ministry had preserved no appearance of unanimity. Great jealousies existed between the Duke of Newcastle and Lord Bute, occasioned *no less* (probably more) by the desire of pre-eminence than by a radical difference of principles and politics. The Duke, on his entrance into public life, enlisted under the banners of party, and was supported through the long period of his ministerial career by party

* Adolphus' Hist. of reign of Geo. III., vol. 1.

and family alliances. Lord Bute pursuing, or perhaps directing, the system of his sovereign, was desirous to free the throne from exclusive domination, and to act independently, resisting claims derived from family and adventitious connections."

It is not difficult to see which system was most likely to be favourable to liberty, and most conducive to the true welfare, and in conformity with the constitutional rights, whether of the nation or the Crown. Why should the Crown and nation be enslaved to an insolent oligarchy? Why should the avenues to political power be closed to all save their servants and adherents? Yet ignorant or interested writers, principally under the influence of the aristocracy, represent Lord Bute's government invidiously as that of a "favourite," and as inimical to "constitutional principle." Why so, unless it is meant that the constitution, as settled at the Revolution, was oligarchical? *Was it so?* No doubt it was so intended by its *authors.*

Now mark. The imbecile Newcastle, desiring to continue the war, resigned, and went into opposition, forming another between the great families with Pitt, Grenville and Temple, the Marquis of Rockingham, Lord Spenser, the Duke of Portland, the Duke of Devonshire, &c. But the Marquis of Bute concluded a peace, which Mr. Adolphus characterises as "wise and just," and which a greater authority—Lord Grenville, then almost dying—declared the best peace he had ever known! Having achieved this great work, and being to all appearance firmly fixed in office, notwithstanding all the attempts to dislodge him, Lord Bute *resigned*, to their great surprise, because "the great families," incessantly engaged in intrigues for place, could not understand a minister voluntarily relinquishing it. But he had, he declared, done the work he desired to do, in the attainment of peace, he retired willingly into private life, and (such is prejudice) he is reviled as a "favourite," and his unprincipled opponent is almost deified as a hero and a patriot!

Well, more intrigues now followed, chiefly occasioned by dissensions among what Mr. Adolphus well calls the "family phalanx" of Pitt and Grenville and Lord Temple. The result was that the king was forced to send for Pitt to assist in forming an administration; but when the king desired to name some parties in whom *he* had

confidence, Pitt told him insolently that a "ministry could not be carried on without the great families who had supported the Revolution Government," that is to say, that his friends among the great families must not only be supreme, but absolute. For, as Mr. Adolphus says, the king had no objection to assure Mr. Pitt and his friends a complete ascendancy in the Cabinet, but could not submit to the exclusive spirit which led Pitt to attempt to fill the whole Council board with one strong, compact, weighty influence. In fact, he assumed absolute power.

Pitt had quarrelled with his brother-in-law, Grenville. Now the latter was First Minister. And by his administration the fatal resolution was taken to tax our American colonies. Retribution was coming. Soon followed the downfall of the Grenville government, and more intrigues of the "great families," especially the "family phalanx" of Pitt and Temple. "Such dissension between the king and the ministry existed," says Mr. Adolphus, "that a spirit of violence urged some members of the Cabinet personally to insult their sovereign, and render their longer continuance in office impossible. All previous attempts to form a new administration failing, the king sent for Mr. Pitt, and in consequence of this interview, Mr. Pitt and Lord Temple had a joint audience, and the king condescended to lay before the two brothers certain propositions for their acceptance," which they refused.

Then the wretched Rockingham administration arose—and fell, lasting long enough to begin the rupture with America. Then more intrigues of the great families ensued; the "family phalanx" was destroyed by the quarrel betwen Pitt and Temple, caused by jealousy. Pitt, now Earl of Chatham, became First Minister, and did little more than repeal the American Stamp Act, and thus, as Mr. Adolphus says, "nourished the seeds of future resistance." Such are the results of these miserable struggles of political parties! Perpetual oscillation, and the interests of an empire sacrificed to faction. In a year or two, after a miserable and discreditable administration, in which he took very little part in public affairs, Lord Chatham resigned, and resumed his factious opposition. In a speech of his own he furnished the best commentary upon the practical results of the Revolution, as illustrated in parliamentary government, by means of party. "What, then," he asked, "are all the generous efforts of our ances-

tors,—are all those glorious contentions by which they meant to secure a known law, and reduced to the conclusion that, instead of the arbitrary power of a king, we must submit to the arbitrary power of a House of Commons? Tyranny is detestable in every shape, but in none so formidable as when it is assumed and exercised by a number of tyrants. But this is not a constitution. We have Magna Charta, we have the Bill of Rights, we have the Act of Settlement." Well, and what effect had these in preventing the tyranny of the "great families," exercised equally over the nation and the Crown?

Lord Mahon thus describes the state of parties at the early part of the reign of George III. "The names of Whig and Tory remained, but no longer with the previous principles and views. Even the keenest of the Tories had ceased to dream of a foreign pretender; their loyalty was fixed on the reigning sovereign; their aim was not, as in bygone years, to subvert, but, on the contrary, to secure against any shock or change, the settled order of things. As a party, however, they were not yet fully formed. The Whigs of 1763, no longer the Whigs of King William or Queen Anne, were split into sections, and it was between these sections, rather than between Whigs and Tories, that the *battle for office raged.*" The Rockinghams and the Bedfords, Mr. Pitt and Mr. Grenville, all equally called themselves good Whigs, were only chiefs of warring parties and rival administrations. Whig writers, says Lord Mahon, satirically, fancy that any Cavendish, or Russell, or Wentworth, must have been of course a patriot and a sage. Deep is their sorrow, dire their perplexity, to find these patriots and sages arrayed on opposite sides, turning each other out of office, and bandying the fiercest invectives and the least complimentary epithets. For instance, in the Duke of Buckingham's Memoirs of the Court and Cabinet of George III., we find one of the Grenville faction branding Lord Shelburne as a liar. These factions were, in a great degree, *family* factions. The Grenvilles, Temple, and Pitt, were connected by marriage; and so of other of the great families, who each had their sect of dependents. These were the only *real* distinctions between the factions. As Lord Mahon truly says, "hard is the task of defining by what *principles* or *opinions* they were kept asunder." He adds, "Even when the differences were substantial, it may be doubted

how far they had arisen from settled views on either side. The accidents of office or opposition in the first instance, the progress of events, and the eagerness arising from either cause, when once adopted, seems sufficiently (he says) to account for the distinction." He mentions the question of the sovereignty over America as an instance. Thus were the interests of the empire trifled with for the sake of party; and Lord Mahon might well ask "whether party were not an evil to the commonwealth, the madness of many for the gain of the few. Was it worth while for statesmen to combine in leagues and factions for the sake even of subaltern intriguers?"

The question was who should govern England? the sovereign or the great families, or rather some powerful individual who should acquire an ascendancy over them, such as Chatham. Both the king and Chatham were equally against "connection;" the difference between them was as to who should be supreme, the Prime Minister or the king. Many persons, some of them in office, most of them independent members of parliament, held that the Crown has a right to choose its own ministers, and that it was the duty of subjects to support them, unless there were some very strong reasons to the contrary. Those who held those views of course looked rather to the personal opinion of the king than to those of the minister. But the minister when, as in the case of Chatham, a proud and imperious man, would not brook any control of his influence, any limitation of his arbitrary will. He would have exclusive and absolute power. Hence the protracted struggles between Chatham and the Crown, which form the great feature of the first part of George III.'s reign. Hence his continual denunciations of a "favourite." No language can describe the intensity of his jealousy; he was not content unless he was arbitrary. He cared neither for his colleagues nor the Crown. Was this constitutional? If so, it was a new constitution, for it naturally made a puppet of the sovereign.

We have already remarked that Lord Rockingham was in the female line a descendant of the great Lord Strafford, and inherited the honours of Wentworth. We recur to this because it naturally suggests the observation that he also followed the policy and aspired to, and for some time possessed the position of Wentworth, without possessing his capacity. He aspired not less than Strafford to

supreme political power, the only difference being that whereas his ancestor proposed to gain it by the influence of the Crown, Rockingham endeavoured to acquire it by the aid of the "great families." In other words, Strafford was the minister of the monarchy, Rockingham of the oligarchy. That was all the difference between them. The difference between Rockingham and Chatham was simply that the latter was a man, like Strafford, of commanding capacity, and asserted his supremacy over the aristocracy as well as over the Crown. Both were equally ministers who ruled by the power of an oligarchy, and without regard to the will of the nation. Thus little had England gained by the fierce contests of two centuries, by a rebellion and a revolution, by civil war and a foreign dynasty; still it was destined to be ruled by an oligarchy, either by a minister capable or incapable, generally incapable, such as Newcastle or Rockingham.

There is truth in what Lord Mahon says on this subject. Speaking of Lord Rockingham, (the descendant of Wentworth, and the patron of Burke,) he says: "Such was the man whom the Whig party, in 1765, chose as their leader." (It may be said perhaps that Rockingham succeeded Pelham.) "Such was the man to whom they continued their allegiance during eighteen years. The selection might surprise us, were it not characteristic of the party. We find the Whigs very frequently preferred for their chiefs, men born and bred in purple. The Marquis of Rockingham," (or the Duke of Newcastle,) "or the Duke of Portland, men without one ray of eloquence or spark of genius, qualities far less sought than high-sounding titles and rich acres. Above all, it seemed to be imagined that a certain small cluster of great houses, as the original Whig junta, should have the first choice of honours and employments." Chatham was as exclusive as Rockingham, and showed his jealousy of the commanding genius of Burke. He was as great an aristocrat as the most unmistakable member of an oligarchy; and the first step he took on gaining office in 1766, was to acquire a peerage for himself, to the surprise of his colleagues and the disgust of the nation. Thus at the interval of a quarter of a century, William Pitt followed the example of William Pulteney, and showed that, despite all his pretensions to patriotism, his first object was not merely political power, but the still smaller one of aristocratic rank.

Speaking of Chatham's retirement in 1770, Lord Mahon says, "It is strange how large a space in the history of England at this period must be devoted to the details of his personal health and family feuds. The fate of the nation seemed to hang suspended on the gout and on the Grenvilles. Whether one such man did or did not feel a twinge on his foot at Hayes; whether that sick man would or would not shake hands with his brother from Stowe or his brother from Wootten, such are the topics which we have to treat as the most important state affairs." So arbitrary was Chatham that he could not even continue united with his relatives the Grenvilles. This arbitrariness, however, if hard to bear from a man of his commanding capacity, yet was of course still more monstrous when united to the most glaring imbecility. Rockingham was as imperious, as exclusive, and as exacting as Chatham. And it was he who made an elaborate appeal to parliament in support of the supremacy of the great families and against the king's choice of a minister. With quiet contempt George III. said of him, "I have not two men in my bedchamber of less parts than Lord Rockingham." With cutting sarcasm Lord Mahon says of him, "Everything about him bore the stamp of the tamest mediocrity, except only his estate, which was large and fine." On the merits of that estate his panegyrists were frequently compelled to rely; one of them in relating his appointment as prime minister, reminded the country of his lordship's great interest in the public welfare in quality of one of the greatest landholders in England. In the House of Lords, even as the leader of a party, he could seldom be persuaded or provoked to rise. One night after Lord Sandwich had been plying him in vain with much raillery and eloquence, Lord Gower could not forbear to whisper, "Sandwich, how could you wrong the poor dumb creature so?" Lord Mahon has the candour to add, that Lord Rockingham had clear good sense and judgment; but so had the king and thousands of his subjects; and those common qualities are scarcely titles to supreme authority over the crown and nation. Yet even this incapable nobleman *claimed* it, as much as Chatham, on the strength of his influence over the great families, an influence mainly owing to his vast estates.

It is curious to see how long the jealousy of a "favourite" that is a minister, the choice of the sovereign, and

really his adviser, was kept up by the ministers of the great families. No one was more unscrupulous in exciting it than Lord Chatham, who, in 1770, after having given up office on account of his long continued ill health, thundered against the invisible, irresponsible, and most pernicious counsels of a favourite. That favourite was Lord Bute, who was at that time abroad. "Yet still," said Chatham, "his influence is kept up by confidential agents as much as if he were at home," and he insinuated that Lord North was the favourite's instrument. Thus, at the distance of five centuries, we still see that same jealousy of the Crown's choice of its advisers, as in the age of Edward and of Spenser. Later still, there was the same jealousy, when Jenkinson was supposed to be the favourite. In fact, it was kept up during the whole of the eighteenth century, the firm character of George III. leading him as much to revolt against the dictation of the "great families," as Chatham was to uphold it. It is true that Chatham himself aspired to an absolute sway over them, and would brook no rival or superior; quarrelling with and discarding not only the ancient minister, his earliest colleague, the Duke of Newcastle, but his own relatives, Grenville and Temple. It is true he despised them, and only wanted to rule by their influence, wielding supreme power himself; and that was the reason the king revolted from his dictation. But in theory he upheld their right to sway, and professed himself the minister of an oligarchy. He was ready to excite them to impose their yoke upon the Crown, and in that spirit he made his famous appeal to the memory of those who had won Magna Charter, and contrasted them with the "silken barons" of modern times. He was then endeavouring to rouse the great families to exert their influence to fetter the authority of the Crown; and showed that he had caught the real spirit and object of the Barons in obtaining the Great Charter. But he who roused the great families to impose their yoke on the Crown, compelled them to wear *his own*, to bow down to his absolute authority, and to obey him, as Lord Shelburne said as "Dictator." What was this but really claiming to govern England as the delegate of an oligarchy?" It was making parliament a Venetian republic, and himself the Doge.

From the date of the revolution (says the Duke of

Buckingham) up to the accession of George III., the independent authority of the Crown can scarcely be said to have had any practical force—scarcely indeed to have had any existence. The government of the country was essentially parliamentary. It was part of the compact with William III. A foreign dynasty had been established, and the two first princes of the house of Hanover, who ruled in England, scarcely spoke our language, and were so ignorant of our constitutions and our customs, that they could not be admitted with safety to an active participation in the Government. The Whigs who had brought about these changes, preserved in their own hands the entire authority of the state. The sovereign was merely the motionless representative of the monarchical principle.

The Duke goes on to show that with George III. it was in some degree otherwise, and that he was jealous of the prerogatives of the Crown. He even carried his zeal so far as to draw upon himself the charge of desiring to strain the rights of the Crown beyond constitutional limitations. But the Duke adds, "These limitations have never been accurately defined, and it has always been difficult to prescribe them."

The result of the firmness of George III. was to bring about the struggle between the Crown and the parliament, or, rather, as the Duke of Buckingham most correctly states it, between the Crown and the "great families" who had hitherto absorbed the power and patronage of the state. "The accession of George III. was followed by a coup d'état, which displaced the cabinet that had been organized by the elder Pitt, to make room for the Earl of Bute," who, says the Duke, was utterly unable to carry it out. But he did in effect carry it out, for the Duke immediately adds, "But his short essay at government had sufficiently disturbed the *ancien régime*, to leave in the king's hands the power of choosing his ministers without reference to popular clamour or the will of parliament." What became of the theory of the constitution? The practical consequence is matter of history. The Duke states it admirably. "A rapid series of ministerial mutations, throughout which the contest for power was maintained on both sides with so fierce a spirit, that during the first ten years of the reign of George III. there were no less than seven successive administrations."

Then came Lord North's ministry in 1770, "and a cabinet of the king's own choice (says the Duke) was founded in security." Then Lord Bute had succeeded in breaking the power of the "great families," for which he was denounced as favourite, just as Wentworth was denounced as favourite of Charles I.; and Gaveston and Spenser as the favourites of Edward II., probably with as much reason; the only ground for the reproach being that the favourite sought, as any servant should, the interests of his sovereign; instead of being the tool of a clique and the instrument of an oligarchy. Well, any how, Lord North, the favourite of George III., formed the most stable government that had existed since the time of Walpole. The administration of Lord North lasted for twelve years, from 1770 to 1782. The American war was with its disastrous and disgraceful issue the great event which marked it, and was a black mark indeed. The blame was cast upon him, but the true causes are to be sought much further back. The proximate cause of our failure was the alliance between our revolted colonies and France. But what caused that? the feelings raised by that long and unjust struggle between Great Britain and the House of Bourbon, which had been brought about originally by the party contests in the time of Walpole; in conformity, however, with older traditions of Whig revolutionary policy, and which more recently had been kept up through the overbearing pursuit of that policy by Pitt. Moreover, the bold resistance of our American colonies was owing in a great degree to the loss of our prestige incurred by the disastrous reverses we had sustained in that part of the world during the previous war. There were other causes in the persecutions which expatriated vast multitudes of our subjects in Ireland and Scotland to the United States. And the loss of those colonies, the greatest disaster ever before sustained by any modern empire, was rather the retribution upon the truculent and unprincipled foreign policy abroad and at home by the Whig ministers of the revolution, than a simple result of the imbecility of Lord North. He was the mere instrument of Providence to avenge the cause of nations; the proximate and immediate cause of a long prepared and long impending retribution.

The Duke of Buckingham blames Lord North for remaining in office, at the king's entreaty, to pursue a

course of policy which his reason and his conscience disapproved. But what drove him to this, was just what drove Walpole into the Spanish war, and made Pitt try to force the Pelham ministry into a French war, viz., a love of power; the love of power which had produced the rebellion and the revolution. The same love of power led Lord North and the Whigs into the "coalition," so called, as though it was the first, or the worst which had taken place since the revolution. Was it anything compared with the "coalition," which was the result of the revolution? was it as bad as the coalition between renegade parasites and treacherous revolutionists? or was it worse than the coalition under Pelham, or Pulteney, or Chatham? Why, the revolution was a coalition, and there had been nothing ever since but coalitions; between men of any principle, every principle, or no principles, just as it might suit the object of the hour and serve the great, sole purpose of acquiring and retaining power.

Why heap peculiar odium on the coalition between Lord North and Fox? No doubt it was discreditable; though, as the Duke of Buckingham observes, it was after all more discreditable to the Whigs than to Lord North, as it was a recantation of all the odium the Whigs had thrown upon him during the whole period of his administration. If they really believed him to be the base and dangerous person they had all along described him to be, the shame was theirs for consenting to associate themselves with him and to work under him in the same government. No doubt. For ten or twelve years they had been denouncing his administration and thwarting all his measures, as those of a weak or wicked minister, and now they joined his ministry and adhered to his administration! No wonder that, as the Duke states, the most important political consequences it effected, so far as political parties were concerned, was to throw the Whigs soon out of office, and sixty years elapsed before they recovered the ground which they had lost under the ministry of Lord North.

When the Duke had said, "The result of Lord North's administration was to throw the Whigs into opposition and to draw down the Tories into closer relations with the throne," he adds, "this complete exchange of position exactly suited the principles of the two great factions, (very aptly and properly expressed—the very phrase Smollett had used just a century before), "the loyalty and

courtly aspirations of the Tories, now that all hope of restoring the Stuarts was at an end, rendering them highly acceptable to the councils of the monarch, while the popular doctrines of the Whigs," (popular doctrines! popular professions; but as to their real deeds and doctrines—if they had any—we have seen), "pointed to the benches of the opposition, as the appropriate place for a party which is always more successful when employed in representing the people, than in exercising the functions of the government."

No doubt the Duke of Buckingham thinks so, because he appears to be of the Tory faction; but what we want to know is, the real difference (if any) between the two factions. The Duke thinks they had exchanged their positions at this period; and of course the Duke, as one of the Tory faction, thought it a good exchange, the Tories being in and the Whigs being out. But what other difference is there between them? Lord Mahon has a notion, that the two factions have exchanged principles, and that the Whigs now are what the Tories were at the revolution; "because," he says, "the Tories then were rather appealing to the people, and the Whigs to the Crown," (a pretty strong confirmation of one great portion of our argument, that the revolution was contrary to the will of the nation), whereas now the Whigs are rather for popular, the Tories for royal or constitutional principles. But the "Tories" are only for the royal and constitutional principles, as stated by the Whigs at the revolution—and Whigs are still for maintaining the same settlement. Both factions have—ever since the Jacobites disappeared,—been united in this view, and they differ only as to the degree to which they desire to admit the popular element into the constitution, which is not a difference of principle, especially as both factions agree in depreciating any such infusion of the popular element as may "endanger the maintenance of our present constitution," in other words, the supremacy of the aristocracy. What difference then is there between what the Duke of Buckingham calls the "two factions," and Lord Mahon the "two parties?" They are ranged under different heads of the "great families," but they are "factions" fighting very much for the same views and the same objects, those views and objects being very much centered in this, the possession of political power. The Duke's "memoirs" exhibit in the most

striking manner, (for example, in the letters relating to the intrigues which followed the dissolution of the "coalition ministry," between the two branches of the Whig faction, the "Rockingham" Whigs and the "Shelburne" Whigs), the eagerness with which the struggle for power was carried on by these "factions," an eagerness showing that it was in their minds the main object to be studied. It is ludicrous and almost disgusting, to notice the intense anxiety they display on this point, contrasted with their apathy as to the public interests. All their ideas seem centred and absorbed in this one idea—office.

After the coalition ministry, came the memorable struggle between Fox and Pitt on the India Bill; a plan, as Lord Temple called it, to take more than half the royal power, and by that means disable the king for the rest of his reign.

The question, no doubt, was important. But it was made a mere matter of party. It is amusing to observe how the Duke of Buckingham involuntarily regards it in that light. "The relative position of *parties* at the opening of 1784 was singular and unprecedented." He could think of nothing else; so imbued was he with the spirit of the papers he was perusing—the records of the party struggles of that day—who made mere shuttlecocks of the interests of empires. The constitutional interest of the transaction is that it was a renewal of the old struggle between the Crown and the oligarchy. Happily for the Crown (and the constitution) the nation was with the Crown. "The exultation of the public on the dismissal of the late ministers, and the accession of Mr. Pitt to power, afforded the undeniable proof that the people were with the sovereign and his advisers," (they having been the chosen of the sovereign.) The coalition wielded a powerful majority in the Commons, with which they continued to harass the cabinet. The king and the cabinet were in short brought into open hostility with the Commons, by the pertinacious resistance of the unnatural and unprincipled combination which—stung by recent failure and disgrace—now manifested greater virulence than ever." The result we need not recal. Pitt was by national reaction firmly seated in power, and ruled England for the remainder of the century. But what if the nation had *not* been with the Crown? As to the precise privileges which would relieve the sovereign on the one hand

from being a mere state puppet, without giving him on the other too great a preponderance of executive power, it might be asked who is to define these "limitations?"; and the passage reminds one of that in which Hume, writing of Charles I., observes, "that had the limitations on prerogative been in his time quite fixed and certain, his integrity would have made him regard as sacred the boundaries of the constitution." But it seems that after the lapse of a century and a half, the "limitations on the prerogative" were no more certain in the time of George III. than in the time of Charles I. So barren of any really practical and valuable political results, either to prince or people, had been the vaunted Revolution, and so utterly uncertain still is our boasted British constitution, the moment the Crown and the oligarchy cease to be in entire accord. The Duke says that "when George III. ascended the throne the relative powers and responsibilities of the sovereign and his advisers were not so clearly marked or so well understood as they are at present." But are they better understood or more clearly marked now than then? Have we since the time of George III. had a monarch capable of raising the question how far the "advisers" of the Crown are competent to be its *dictators?* Was a man of pleasure, such as George IV., or of easy good nature such as William IV., at all likely to test such a principle? We know that the first was forced to yield his own opinion on Catholic Emancipation, and the second upon Parliamentary Reform. But suppose they had *not* yielded. And constitutionally why should not the Crown have a right to its independent opinion as well as either of the other two branches of the legislature? Otherwise the Crown is a mere "stage puppet," and not a co-ordinate branch of the legislature. Is it according to the constitution that the Crown should yield its deliberate judgment to the will of parliament? Then the Crown is a "puppet." The Crown yielded in the two last reigns. What would have become of the constitution if it had not yielded? The Duke of Buckingham says truly that George III. resisted the extreme demands of his parliament, but that this was an error against the excess of which our constitution affords the easiest and simplest means of redress." Indeed! How? We know what the "means of redress" were which were resorted to by the "advisers of the Crown" on the two occasions to which we have adverted.

The monarch was simply frightened. Sir R. Peel's Memoirs, and Mr. Roebuck's History of the Whig Ministries, have shown how. In the one case by a prophecy of rebellion, on the other, by a menace of revolution, the Crown was frightened by its own advisers. Is that constitutional? Surely not. But what other "means of redress" can be resorted to to correct an "error," or the "excess" of an error in the Crown, in refusing to yield to the "extreme" demands of parliament? Who is to decide what is an error, or an excess of error, or an extreme demand? George III. held out until the opinion of the people was in his favour, and then appealed to them. But supposing that they had not been in his favour, and that he had still held out, what "means of redress" does the constitution afford? None. The only remedy is revolution. But this destroys the "constitution," which supposes each branch of the legislature co-ordinate and independent.

The great difficulty would not be solved by what is miscalled an "appeal to the people." There was no such thing in the last century as an appeal to the nation. Is there now? There was, indeed, an appeal to the "constituencies," which then meant (for the most part) the dependents and nominees of the "two great factions" of the oligarchy, and which Pitt himself felt to be so; for he pretended to redeem the pledge he had given to propose a large measure of parliamentary reform, so as to secure something like a representation of the people. But he took care to clog it with the monstrous principle of pecuniary compensation for disfranchised boroughs! a principle which he knew would afford a pretence for the rejection of the measure, a pretence of which Fox eagerly availed himself, and threw it out. We call it a pretence, and say that Fox was as much a pretender in the matter as Pitt, because Fox, instead of rejecting the bill, might have rejected the clause, or might have proposed a new measure himself. He did neither. He no more desired a representation of the people than Pitt. They conspired together to prevent it. Yet Fox is called a "patriot." He was as much an aristocrat as Pitt, and the only difference between them was that Pitt pretended to be the champion of the Crown, and Fox pretended to be the champion of the people. They were neither of them either the one or the other. They were champions of oligarchical factions, each

struggling for political power, and both upholding an oligarchical system. A general election was merely a means of testing the political strength of the two factions, and the influence of the great families, either their close boroughs or their tenant farmers. To call it an appeal to the *people* was absurd. The people had no political power in the last century. And for saying this, and for striving to gain some power for the people, men were *transported as felons*, as Muir and Gerrard, Margarot and Palmer were; and for meeting to petition parliament for a reform of the representation, men unarmed—aye, and women and children—were mown down in masses, as they were even in the present century at the Manchester Massacre. Yet all the while the numerous editions of Blackstone which issued from the press taught, that it was one of the constitutional rights of the people to be represented in parliament, and another, to meet and discuss their grievances, and petition their representatives. So different is false theory from real facts. Pitt got into power with the national will, but he ruled in defiance of it, and a war fever was raised, and another French war entered upon, in order to divert the mind of the nation from organic change and parliamentary reform. The old trick of state craft, invented by the Whigs at the Revolution, to enable them to enslave the nation, and secure a monopoly of power, was now resorted to by a minister who was, though called a Tory, as much a Whig as his father, or his old enemy Walpole, in order to divert the mind of the nation from dwelling on their slavery. The trick succeeded. A few prosecutions for sedition, and the dexterous raising of the war fever, prevailed; and England lived on through the rest of the century, aye, and has lived on half through the next, without any real political power being attained by the bulk and body of the people. The war with France was begun in 1793, on the old pretence, the balance of power. The royal message, however, betrayed the real reason—a dread of revolutionary principles. The Duke of Buckingham admits it was "in some degree" a war of principles. It was nothing else. But what was "the principle" against which we were contending? The principle on which our own Revolution was *pretended* to be conducted, the principle of government according to the national will. In our case it was but a pretence, for, as we have shown, the people had no part in the Revolution, but with the French it was more a reality. They pro-

fessed at all events the same principle, and they carried it out more thoroughly than we had done. That the real reason of the war was the apprehension of the aristocracy as to the principles of national representation, is clear from the fact that the government put down, as seditious, associations with that object. And the Duke of Buckingham betrays the truth when he thus describes what was the actual and doubtless the expected result of the war fever. The spirit of the country was awakened in defence of those "constitutional principles," (the supremacy of the aristocracy, and the exclusion of the people from political power) which presented the surest safeguard for the public liberties; and the delusions which at first had seized upon the factious and discontented, rapidly vanished as the war advanced. These "delusions" were as to the right of the people to some share of political power, delusions which have since received the solemn sanction of the legislature, and are now consecrated as part of those "constitutional principles" which in the last century were described as repugnant to them!

One result of the ill success of England in the war was the usual one—some idea of relaxing the Whig laws, which kept the Catholics from the privileges of citizens. Lord Fitzwilliam, the Lord Lieutenant, was convinced that the state of Ireland required emancipation, but the cabinet was not ripe for it; he was recalled, and we had instead of emancipation, the rebellion and the union. Still the minds of ministers were uneasy on the subject, and we find in the Duke of Buckingham's "Memoirs" Lord Grenville, speaking of the "infatuation of the Irish Orangemen," and owning his anxiety about "some provision for the Catholic clergy." We have retrograded in enlightenment, and having seen Pitt and Peel in the endowment of Maynooth, do something to carry out the liberal policy of Grenville, we have seen in successive sessions the House of Commons hesitating as to reversal of that policy, and the perpetration of an egregious public robbery. However with the Union, the refusal of emancipation and of national representation, and the prosecution of a war against the principles of revolution, ended the eighteenth century, during which, as we have shown, this country was governed in a great degree without regard to the will of the Crown, but always without reference to the will of the great body of the people; in short, was governed by an oligarchy.

ART. V.—*The Testimony of the Rocks, or Geology in its Bearings on the Two Theologies, Natural and Revealed.* By Hugh Miller, author of "The Old Red Sand Stone," &c. Edinburgh: Thomas Constable and Co.

WE much fear that a sort of general impression prevails in some portions of society, that the progress of science is inimical to the interests of religion. We cannot wonder indeed that such a fear should disturb the minds of the more religious class of Protestants. Protestantism, so far as it has any *positive* existence, is founded upon human opinion. It has not, and cannot have within it the element of divine faith. Faith is the correlative of testimony. Catholics have faith in the divine testimony for ever perpetuated in the Church. To them the voice of the Church is the voice of God, and as such commands absolute submission. On this point Protestants are continually misunderstanding us from their inability to *realise*, to use a favourite word of theirs, the divine presence and its living utterance. They accuse us of servile submission to the priesthood, of mental slavery, of forgetting the dignity of our nature, and we know not what else, because we yield absolute assent and obedience to the voice of the Church. Now the real and simple question is, Does the Church speak with the authority of God? The Catholic of course maintains that she does, and upon that hypothesis, not even a Deist can consistently maintain that there is any slavery or loss of dignity in rendering absolute obedience. For who can admit that God exists, and yet deny that He is to be obeyed? Nothing more plainly shows the inability of Protestants to apprehend the Real Presence of God in His Church, than their constant repetition of this objection against Catholics, that they are a poor abject set of priest-ridden beings who dare not think for themselves. If Protestants had any true conception of the Catholic doctrine of the Real Presence, their efforts would be directed to disprove the fact that God speaks in His Church; and not be wasted in abuse of Catholics for doing what on their hypothesis every rational being must do. Protestantism is built not upon faith, but upon opinion. As has been shown over and over again, it avails nothing for the Pro-

testant to say that he believes in the testimony of the Bible or of the Apostles' Creed, because he has no answer to the very obvious question which immediately arises, In what sense do you believe these formulas? When persons who profess to have faith in the testimony of the Bible differ as widely as the Trinitarian from the Unitarian, as the Episcopalian from the Independent and the Baptist—and when persons who profess to believe the testimony of the creed differ as widely as the High Church from the Broad Church, and both from the Low Church, is it not obviously a mere self-deception to talk about *believing* the testimony of the Bible or of the Creed? What such persons do depend upon—it would be a misnomer to say believe—is *their own opinion* of what the Bible or the Creed teaches. The High Church Anglicans, who profess to take the tradition or interpretation of the first ages, in vain struggle to deliver themselves from this dilemma; for the same free opinion which other Protestants exercise upon the Bible or Creed, they exercise upon the writings of the early Fathers.

Protestantism, then, being necessarily built upon opinion, we need feel no wonder that religious-minded Protestants should tremble at the progress of science. We confine our observation to that class, because the far more numerous class of indifferent Protestants, who care little or nothing for the dogmas of Christianity, undoubtedly have no fear of the kind; they rather rejoice if the discovery of science seems to militate against Christian dogma, because they regard the dogmas of religion as interfering with, rather than as promoting, their views of a liberal religion. But the more serious class of Protestants may very justly fear, lest the progress of science, or at least some supposed scientific discovery, should modify or subvert their favourite interpretations of Scripture, or otherwise influence their most approved religious conclusions.

The Catholic stands upon a ground entirely distinct and separate from that of the Protestant. His religion is founded upon faith in the divine testimony. He knows that whatever else may be true or false, his religion is infallibly true. With him religion is one thing, science is another. Each has its own separate office and department. And if in any point they should seem to clash and contradict each other, the Catholic cleaves to what is cer-

tain—his religion, and leaves it to time and inquiry to clear up the difficulty. We here of course speak of a Catholic well instructed and faithful to his religion. At the same time we are prepared to admit that there is one point upon which some just apprehension may be felt.

We admit that evil may follow where the partial discoveries of science seem to conflict with the imperfectly understood testimony of Holy Scripture. We trust indeed that the error is almost exploded which would lead us to look for the conclusions of science in the Bible. It is the office of the Holy Book to teach religion, not science; we are therefore not to expect any explanation or development of scientific subjects. At the same time, the Bible being written by men inspired of God, is in every department infallibly true. Whether it tells of anything which touches on science or history, or any other subject whatever, *its meaning*, however expressed, is unquestionably true. We speak of its "meaning" emphatically because some persons have fallen into a very palpable blunder upon this point. An inaccurate expression may not only be true, but may be the only means by which the truth intended can be conveyed. To take a familiar example. Some persons have imagined that the words of Joshue in his victory over the kings of Canaan, militate against the theory of the Copernican system. "Move not, O sun, toward Gabaon, nor thou, O moon, toward the valley of Ajalon. And the sun and the moon stood still until the people had revenged themselves of their enemies." Undoubtedly the expression is inaccurate, for astronomy teaches us that it is the earth and not the sun which thus relatively moves. But yet the fact intended to be expressed is infallibly true, and could only be expressed in language suitable to the apprehensions of those to whom it was addressed. Undoubtedly if one of the designs of the Bible were to teach us the science of astronomy, we should here detect an error, just as if a scientific lecturer on the subject should tell us that the sun moves relatively to the earth. But the object of the Bible was to relate a miracle, and the relation would have been utterly unintelligible to those for whom it was written if it had been made in scientific terms. If Joshue had been inspired to say, Earth cease to rotate round your axis, moon and earth keep your present position to each other, he would have spoken gibberish in the ears of the Israelites. To make a difficulty here can only be paralled

by the conduct of a man who would seriously charge another with falsehood for speaking of the sunrise and sunset; or of the sun entering any of the signs of the zodiac.

The plain fact is, that the Bible is to be interpreted like any other book which uses popular language, unless there be a reason for doing otherwise. For instance, even in a book, although written expressly upon the subject of astronomy, we should not be surprised to find the terms "sunrise" and "sunset," unless in that particular passage it was professing to give an account of the motion of the heavenly bodies. Much less in a non-scientific book like the Bible are we to be disturbed by expressions which, though scientifically inaccurate, are popularly expressive of the truth. For the purpose which Joshue and the Israelites had in view it was perfectly immaterial whether the earth rotates upon its axis, or the sun travels round the earth. They only desired that their relative positions for a time should be unchanged, and this was expressed in the ordinary language of the day.

On the other hand, science itself is only partial in its discoveries. Of course certain points may be proved almost to demonstration, such for instance as the enormous period of the existence of this earth's matter; and yet other discoveries may follow, which will greatly modify the apparent inconsistency of this fact with the Mosaic narrative of the creation of the world. It may be then the cause of some just apprehension to the Catholic, lest in this transition state, so to speak, the faith of some weak brethren should be shaken. If men will be patient and wait for the full developments of science, nothing is to be feared. The ultimate conclusions of science are certain not to contradict the assertions of Scripture rightly understood; they will probably illustrate and confirm them. It is only of *partial* knowledge that we need entertain any fear—a knowledge which is very apt to come under St. Paul's description of "the knowledge that puffeth up." It is a great snare to youth. A young man captivated by some scientific pursuit, and easily carried away with some new discovery, is very apt to put a part for the whole, and to imagine that he has mastered a subject of which he has really entered but the very outside verge; and then meeting with something which seems to him to contradict the Bible, or to

account on natural grounds for something which it ascribes to miracle, he lends too ready an ear to the suggestions of the sceptic or the infidel.

It has been a favourite accusation of Protestants against the Catholic Church, that she has endeavoured to hinder or suppress the discoveries of science. The persecution, as it is termed, of Galileo is unceasingly appealed to as a proof of this. How unjustly this charge has been brought against the Church we have already had occasion to show.* We need not repeat the arguments which we have there adduced. It is sufficient to say here that the authorities of the Church have unquestionably always placed the spiritual and eternal interests of her members before any temporal interest whatsoever. The salvation of man is a far higher object than the progress of science: and we have no hesitation in maintaining that if in the judgment of the Church the promulgation of any scientific truth was more likely to hinder men's salvation than to promote it, she would not only be justified in her efforts to suppress it, but it would be her bounden duty to do her utmost to suppress it. The Protestant no doubt will cry out against this conclusion. His own principles are opposed to it. He is emphatically an *inquirer* into truth. He is so in religion as much as in science, and hence consistently enough he considers the suppression of any truth of any kind as treason against his first principles. The Catholic stands upon different grounds. He has not a religion to seek or inquire for. He has already found his religion. It is to him the most sure and certain of all things. In all other inquiries or pursuits this is assumed as absolutely and infallibly certain. Suppose, then, that in the case of the discoveries of Galileo, or of any similar discoveries, the court of Rome should judge that the promulgation of these discoveries amongst the people would endanger the faith of some, without aiding the faith of any, can it be a question amongst any who believe in a world to come that it was its bounden duty to stop the promulgation of those discoveries? It is of course open to the Protestant to question the correctness of the judgment: that is another matter. But, assuming that the judgment was correct, it follows as an incontrovertible con-

* Dublin Review, vol. v.

clusion that the everlasting interests of religion are to be preferred to the temporal interests of the advancement of knowledge.

Hence we are by no means prepared to admit as a universal and absolute proposition that the progress of science must be always favourable to religion. We hold as strongly as any man can do that the *perfect knowledge* of anything is certain to be consistent with, and probably helpful to the perfect knowledge of religion. But it by no means follows that at all times and under all circumstances the progress of the one will be helpful to the other. To take this famous case of Galileo as an illustration; we consider that setting aside the question of the truth of his propositions, it was a legitimate subject of inquiry for the court of Rome, whether or not it would be advantageous to the faith to allow those propositions to be publicly communicated, and that it was bound to act accordingly. But all such matters are under the influence of times and circumstances. Whatever might be the case in the seventeenth century, it is impossible in the nineteenth century, whether for good or for evil, to stay or even to regulate the enunciations of scientific truth and discovery. The day of esoteric theories is past. Knowledge can no longer be dispensed as by "a faithful and wise steward whom his Lord setteth over his family to give them their measure in due season." In our days it is subject to no regulation and to no control; and the Church, as she has ever done, adapts herself to new times and new circumstances. The Church has two things to fear, the misuse of true knowledge, and the natural influence of defective knowledge. It may be admitted that in our times any check upon the former has become utterly beyond her control. For good or for evil knowledge has gone forth as a mighty stream to overflow the whole earth. She has then but to set herself to the utmost of her power against the second evil—that is, against the mischief which arises from the defect of knowledge; and hence it may be boldly asserted that the interests of the Church are so far identified with the progress of science. She has nothing to fear, but everything to hope from every step which it makes in advance. However untimely the enunciation of any scientific truth may possibly be, it cannot do her half the injury which will probably oftentimes follow from science partially or defectively developed. The truth ultimately can do no

harm, although, temporarily, injury may follow from an unseasonable application of it. Whereas a partial and defective knowledge mistakenly supposed to be entire and complete, may seem to give certain and infallible grounds for scepticism.

We trust that none of our readers will be alarmed by the admission which we have freely made that an unseasonable revelation of scientific truth may be injurious to the interests of religion. We are quite prepared to hear the scoff of the infidel and the jeer of the sceptic and irreligious. Your craft can only prosper, they will say, by keeping men in ignorance, you are afraid to face the plain and open truth. In reply to such scoffs we appeal to the judgment of reason, and even of common sense. We yield to none in the desire to reach truth in every department of knowledge. But, we ask, is it reasonable to endanger the highest interests of men, for those which after all are but temporary and of this world? We of course assume that man is an immortal being, destined to an everlasting existence; that his future happiness or misery is dependent upon his conduct in this world; and that this conduct again is dependent upon his reception of that revelation which God vouchsafed to him. Further, it will not be denied that, although where knowledge is perfect, one truth cannot contradict or oppose another, yet where knowledge is imperfect, what seems to be knowledge on one side may contradict what seems to be knowledge on the other. Hence then to put a case, suppose a Christian to be so imperfectly instructed as to imagine that the Bible asserts that the sun goes round the earth, and that to demonstrate the contrary to him would shake his belief in the testimony of the Bible altogether; we must maintain that it would be an act of great cruelty to risk the shipwreck of his faith by giving, unnecessarily, and out of the fitting time and circumstances, such a demonstration. Better by far that he should remain ignorant of an astronomical truth, than that his religious belief should be so endangered. And, in fact, what is this, but that which common sense teaches us in the communication of all knowledge? There is a time for all things. An intelligent instructor well knows that to communicate some department of knowledge, however true in itself, before his pupil had mastered other departments, would impede rather than promote the general advancement of the pupil. Even in

the most certain of all sciences, some of the higher branches of mathematics bring out results, which at first sight would seem inconsistent with the limited knowledge of beginners. While then we advocate, heartily and entirely, the advancement of knowledge in all things,—while we would zealously pursue truth in all its branches, "uncaring consequences," we still say in the name of common sense, let that pursuit proceed with due attention to times and circumstances; and let the knowledge of all things be received in its just and due proportions. What ground for reflection upon the Catholic religion is there, if it insists on what is so palpable even to common sense? The worst that is said against the court of Rome in the case of Galileo, is that it forcibly suppressed the promulgation of scientific truth. It is not alleged that Galileo himself was in any way hindered from pursuing his studies. If, then, we repeat, the Roman authorities thought that, setting aside the question of the truth or falsehood of Galileo's theories, it was injurious to the interests of religion at that time to propagate them, what was it but to prefer the interests of eternity to the interests of time,—what but to value the salvation of the soul more than mere mental enlightenment, to say that for the time these scientific conclusions should not be made known?

We will now proceed to notice one or two points on which it has been supposed that the discoveries of science have interfered with the interests of religion. Our limits will not admit of our entering at large into this important subject; we must content ourselves with noticing one or two instances by way of example.

Perhaps one of the most common and most subtle sources of discomfort to the minds of some Christians, arises from considerations of the insignificancy of our planet, as deduced from the discoveries of science. It cannot be denied or doubted that Holy Scripture speaks of this world and of its inhabitants, and of the events occurring upon it, as if they were the very centre of the Divine counsels, the special and pre-eminent objects of the Divine care, and occasioning the highest exercise of Divine action. At first sight, then, at least it seems not a little inconsistent with the impression produced by these features in the Divine economy, that, as astronomy teaches us, this world of ours is but a secondary planet in one comparatively small system of the heavenly bodies; that our sun is but

one, not of the largest, of those multitude of stars which bespangle the heavens; and again, as geology teaches us, that the period during which man has existed on the face of the earth is but a very very little span in the enormous endurance of its existence. Such questions as these are apt, if not actually to suggest themselves for solution, yet to insinuate themselves, in the hour of temptation, to the disturbance and discomfort of the mind; Can God have such care for this little insignificant world? Surrounded as He is by all the glories of His creative Hand, with His Eye upon the myriads of worlds and systems of worlds which we can see, and probably myriads more which we cannot see, is it to be believed that He has fixed his special regard on this little speck in creation;—that He has so interfered in our affairs, and made us the objects of His special love and care? Is it not more probable that man has flattered himself into these conclusions from a disproportionate conception of his own importance, founded upon an ignorance of those overpowering discoveries which science has revealed to us? The Catholic, if faithful to his religion, happily has a shield which effectually protects him from assaults of this character—we mean his unwavering faith in the truth of the Incarnation of the Son of God. It is impossible for a Protestant to comprehend how firmly this truth is riveted in the very heart's core of the faithful Catholic. It has been drunk in with his mother's milk, and nourished day by day with the wonderful appliances of the Church. But where this firm faith exists, of course the difficulty built upon the insignificancy of our world and of its inhabitants, can have no place; for whatever may be the nature or extent of the rest of creation, the fact that the co-equal Son of God took upon Him the flesh of man, invests man, and the earth itself, from which he was taken, with an importance, compared with which all creation, whatever be its immensity, sinks into nothing.

But we must not conceal from ourselves the fact that this astronomical revelation is frequently made the foundation of an objection which lies far deeper, and which, it may be feared, not unfrequently disturbs the minds of many whose religion does not protect them. It is supposed to invalidate the doctrine of the Incarnation itself. How improbable, it is said, that God should interfere in this marvellous way for beings so insignificant as men, inhabiting this remote corner of His vast creation. When we

think of those innumerable worlds which the powers of the telescope disclose to us, and reflect that the probable or almost certain reason why we do not see other worlds as numerous or even more so, is only because the power of vision, however assisted, is still limited, how can we imagine that God should have bestowed such care upon us,—how is it credible that for such a minute part of His creation, He should have devised the wondrous plan of Redemption?

We think no one can deny the difficulty, *primâ facie*, which here presents itself,—the greater perhaps to the minds of some, because it seems to appeal to their humility. And yet we do not despair of shewing, in a very few remarks, how utterly and entirely groundless are the premisses upon which it is attempted to build up such a difficulty.

A few years ago a clever and ingenious little book was published entitled, "On the Plurality of Worlds."* The

---

* This little work created quite a sensation at the time of its appearance,—especially amongst sentimental religionists who could not bear this disturbance to all their pretty thoughts and sayings about "distant worlds" and "worlds unseen." The consequence was that replies were written to it in anger, and with the absence of that philosophic calmness which it is most needful to bring to the consideration of such subjects. Some of the author's opponents wished to fasten upon him the very absurd argument, that because man could not exists on one of those planets—assuming that the same laws pervade the whole system,—*therefore* they cannot be inhabited by any intelligent beings. The author of that suggestive little work is far too clever to have used any such ridiculous argument. What he really does say is this;—you assume without any sufficient grounds, that the starry systems are peopled with intelligent creatures, bearing a close analogy to man. I doubt it. It is for you to prove your point, or at least to suggest probable reason. Of all subjects, this is one in which a negative is incapable of proof, but I maintain that probability makes rather against your theory than for it. All scientific enquiry assumes that the same laws prevail everywhere. We conclude that *Mercury* and *Venus* are kept in their orbits by the very same law which keeps the earth in her's,—and that the influence of the sun is the same in all. Take the case of *Mercury;* then by all the laws of which we have any knowledge, the heat is too great for man, or for the vegetable kingdom to exist. Take the case of the *Georgium Sidus*, and the same impossibility arises from cold. The author further shews, in general, that

object of the Author was not, as has been often mistakenly misrepresented, to prove that the planets cannot be inhabited by rational beings,—and we observe that most of the replies which have been attempted to this little work, have proceeded on that erroneous assumption,—but it was rather to shew that the *onus probandi* lay on the other side. The author further showed, that assuming the same laws that regulate our world to operate in more distant spheres, —an assumption upon which all the philosophical conclusions are built,—there is an extreme improbability that any rational creatures, such as men, can inhabit those regions. People may suppose, if they will, that intellectual beings may dwell in a fiery atmosphere, which would consume us in a moment; or in no atmosphere at all, or in water, or under any other circumstances; but the result would be the conception of a being altogether so different from man, that it would very much destroy the importance and interest of any conclusion which might be drawn from the supposition. When persons speak of the planets as inhabited, we suppose they picture to themselves inhabitants at least bearing some analogy to the being of man; and that their interest in such speculations would be very much destroyed if their vision was confined to the possibility of finding those worlds inhabited by intellectual salamanders and sapient fishes. And we will venture to say that any difficulty to our religious faith which is built upon theories so excessively vague and unintelligible is worth very little indeed.

But then, perhaps, it will be said, Is it not difficult to imagine that amongst the innumerable spheres which people the heavens, one only should contain man made in the image of God? Are we to suppose that all those innumerable worlds, and others unseen, exist without a purpose or an end? To which we answer, Whether any other world contains a creature like to man made in the image of God, is altogether beyond the limits of human conjecture; and, as to purpose and end, no doubt the all-wise Creator has a reason for all He does. But even on the assumption

---

the grounds upon which it is assumed that the heavenly bodies are inhabited are quite insufficient to carry such a conclusion, But, he never attempts anything so absurd as to *prove* that the heavenly bodies are not inhabited.

that all those myriads of worlds are uninhabited by intelligent beings, and answer no purpose that man can divine; still it is no more than consistent with that lavish character which we everywhere behold of God's creative Hand, that such worlds should exist. We might as well ask for what purpose have those innumerable creatures existed which the researches of geologists have shewn to have lived in the earth long anterior to the age of man? Or again, wherefore are the swamps of America or Africa peopled with innumerable tribes of insects and reptiles which live and die unseen and unknown by man? Or why again is the same power of the Creator displayed at the icy poles where man cannot even exist? Why is all this waste? we might in our presumptuous ignorance inquire. The answer is, How can the finite comprehend the Infinite? In fact, such difficulties as these arise altogether from the attempt to measure the works of God by the comprehension of man. While we write, the following remarkable example of the exuberant fecundity in creation is given by Professor Huxley, in a lecture delivered at the Royal Institution. Speaking of the phenomena of germination or budding, as exhibited in those small insects called aphides, that infest plants, he made out that insignificant as these small insects appear, they are sources of productive vitality sufficient, if unchecked, to stock the world with living creatures in the course of a single summer. The aphis at the end of the summer hybernates, and during hybernation it alters its character, and changes from a viviparous to an oviparous insect. The eggs when hatched produce both winged and wingless aphides, those with wings being males and the wingless ones females. The winged aphides rise in myriads in the air, and constitute what is known as "blight." It almost surpasses the power of the mind to estimate the numbers of these insects that may be produced by a single one in the course of a summer. Assuming from observation, that a budding aphis produces one hundred at a brood, and that there are nine broods in the summer, the mass of vitality thus produced from a single one would be so enormous, that even supposing a hundred aphides to weigh only a grain, the weight of the whole would exceed that of a thousand millions of men, that is of the estimated human population of the whole globe—an apparently almost incredible result, and yet on the moderate assumption of

the Professor, capable of mathematical proof. What, then is there really more wonderful in the existence of the planets, or of systems of planets, than in the existence of so many insects or tribes of insects? The Word which spake one into existence, with equal ease, spake the other into existence also: and if it be so that the innumerable stars of heaven, with their unknown numbers of satelites, are formed of mere inert matter, destitute of all living creatures, such a fact would really present no greater difficulty to us, than do other facts before our eyes, in which we behold the lavish bounty of the Creator displayed in works of exquisite skill and wisdom, which yet apparently fulfil no purpose to man. Great and small are relative terms. What appears to us stupendously great, may to other created beings, seem as small as the grains of sands seem to us. Again, there is no measure or proportion between the finite and the Infinite; and supposing creation to consist of innumerable worlds, they bear no greater proportion to the greatness of God than does this little world of ours.

And this, therefore, is the reply to the objection raised from the opposite consideration; that if we conceive of innumerable worlds inhabited by intelligent creatures like ourselves, it seems altogether extravagant to imagine that Almighty God should have sent His Son to redeem so insignificant a portion of His creation as man. We say that this *comparative* insignificancy exists entirely in our own conceptions, and not at all in the mind of God. All creation is as nothing in His sight. We may strain our imagination to the utmost in conceiving illimitable space peopled with worlds of glorious intelligences, and yet we approach no nearer to God. Still the wide gulf between creature and Creator is not even narrowed. Hence the reasonableness of redemption, so to speak, stands altogether apart from such considerations. If we feel that it would take off something of the marvellousness of the Son of God dying as an expiation for sin, if we were assured that millions and millions of worlds were along with us partakers of the benefit; we have formed an imperfect and erroneous conception of that stupendous act. Catholic theology teaches us, that if there had been but one sinner to be redeemed, Christ would, with equal willingness, have laid down His life for that one; and in the salvation

of that one would "have seen the travail of His soul and have been satisfied."

We conclude, then, that all the difficulties which have been felt in the supposed discrepancy between the discoveries of astronomy, and the facts of the Christian religion, arise from our forming untrue conceptions of God and of ourselves. Men heedlessly transfer into the regions of the finite, considerations which can only be truly weighed when viewed in connection with the infinite. It requires indeed an effort to divest ourselves of the thoughts of comparative greatness and littleness, which belong exclusively to our condition as creatures, and which really can have no place when we contemplate the Creator. We forget that our immensity is no immensity to Him "who hath measured the waters of the sea in the hollow of His hand, and weighed the heavens with His palm."

Another ground upon which the progress of science has been supposed to be injurious to religion, is in the discovery that some things heretofore attributed to miraculous interposition have been, or may have been due to natural causes. Now this objection arises partly from a confusion of terms, and partly from a false contrast. For it by no means proves an event not to be miraculous, that it has arisen from natural causes. The miracle may not be in itself anything strictly supernatural, and yet its combinations and accompaniments may render it truly so. Of such a kind, doubtless were many of the miracles performed by our Lord and the Apostles. There is nothing necessarily miraculous in the sudden healing of disease. Such things have occurred from what are termed natural causes. A fever has suddenly left a person where there has been no pretension to miracle. A net may be let down into a shoal of fishes, and the labour which has hitherto been fruitless, may be rewarded by an abundant draught. There is nothing miraculous in all this. But that a fever should leave a person precisely at the moment that another bids it do so, that under the same accompaniment, the wind should suddenly cease, or a shoal of fishes come within the reach of the net; that such a combination should occur not once, which might be accident, but many times, this is truly supernatural or miraculous. It is nothing to the purpose then, to say, that the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrha might be by a volcanic eruption, or the passage through the Red Sea might be effected by means of winds

and shoals, or that there might be natural thunder clouds at the giving of the Law from Mount Sinai; or that darkness at our Lord's death might be helped by an eclipse of the sun; and various other statements of this kind. Supposing all this to be true, it does not take off from the miraculous character of the events. Who was it or what was it that disposed these events so that they occurred at the precise time in which they did occur? Is the hand of God less visible because He had so ordered and disposed natural causes that they should work at the precise moment at which they were required? Is not this quite as supernatural as if by the fiat of His Almighty will, He had commanded the events to happen without any intervening cause? If we may make a comparison at all, we may say that the former is the more wonderful method of the two. A sudden interruption of the laws of nature, is not so wonderful as such a disposition of the action of those laws as will, in due time, bring about an extraordinary and unusual application of them. Of course we are here employing the *argumentum ad hominem*. We are not so presumptuous as to pretend to decide what method it may please Almighty God to employ in His wondrous dealings with men. The methods may be various; some miracles seem to be caused by the actual interruption or suspension of the laws of nature. In others we are expressly directed to seek for the immediate occasion of them in the supernatural application of the common order of natural causes. So the probability is that both methods are employed. But what we maintain is, that granting the utmost that philosophical sceptics can demand, supposing that all recorded miracles were traceable to the operation of immediate natural causes; this would not in the slightest degree invalidate the reality of them, until it was further shewn that the whole occasion and combination of circumstances were such as arose naturally without any indication of disposal by a Superior Hand.

And here we may add one word on what are commonly called providential events—events which a religious man will unhesitatingly trace to the interposing Hand of Providence, although there is nothing absolutely supernatural about them. For instance, a man escapes in a railway accident where others are killed; or some apparently trivial circumstance prevents him embarking in a ship which afterwards founders at sea; or again, a pesti-

lence extends itself over the length and breadth of the land. In these and such like events the pious mind is not slow in recognising the hand of God, sparing or chastising. The sceptic laughs at such conclusions. Why, he will ask, should God spare you rather than another? what you attribute to His care, is a mere accidental escape from an ordinary storm. And why should you trace to His chastising Hand what any one may discover to have arisen from a foul drain, or an unclean dwelling? Now, here again the objection probably arises from a confusion of terms. If the Christian means that the Hand of God is more really present in effecting his escape from an accident or a storm, or in sending a pestilence, than it is at other times, unquestionably he lies under a mistake; for the Hand of God is at all times equally present, and His watchful eye is always upon us. But the intelligent Christian does not mean anything of the kind. He only means that there are special occasions for recognising the presence of God's Hand, which is ever over us, and special calls of thankfulness for that unremitting care which is ever extended towards us. God at all times orders all things by His unerring Providence. "Not a sparrow falleth to the ground without Him." The cases we have referred to are examples of God's universally superintending Providence, not exceptions to it, and all that a Christian means when he says here or there is the Hand of God, is, that in these particular instances there is a special call for its recognition.

Finally, in referring to the science of geology we cannot fail to remember the time, in our early days, when its discoveries were paraded by some as fatal to the veracity of the Mosaic history of the creation. It was boldly stated that the Mosaic account attributed the creation of the matter of this earth to a period not more remote than six or seven thousand years ago, whereas the facts disclosed by geologists showed that it had existed for countless ages. Now it may be well adduced as a lesson to us against such hasty conclusions, that no one at this time of day feels the slightest difficulty on this point. Unquestionably geology tells us of an enormous period during which this earth of ours has existed; but when we come to examine more closely the Mosaic narrative, we find nothing in it inconsistent with that conclusion. There are two principal theories whereby the Mosaic account is shown to be

reconcilable with the discoveries of geology. The first is that adopted by Dr. Buckland, and many others, namely, that the first verse of the Book of Genesis simply states that at the beginning of all things God created the heaven and the earth,—that is, that He brought all things out of nothing; and that, between what is there recorded, and what is recorded in the second verse, there may elapse any indefinite amount of time; and then, in the second verse, the sacred historian begins his account of what occurred when God gave to the already created matter of the earth its present form and mode of existence. The chief objection to this theory is one to which we attach no very great weight. It is objected that the science of geology shews that the remains of many of the extinct species of animals are intermingled with the remains of animals now existing upon the earth, so appearing to interlace the existing creature with the previous periods; whereas if the above theory held good we should naturally find an impassable gulf between the two. If the old world, it is said, was entirely destroyed, and an entirely new creation commenced at the Mosaic period, then all the previous animals would have been of one type, and all the succeeding animals of another, which is contrary to fact.

Thus Mr. Miller says:

"It is a great fact, now fully established in the course of Geological discovery, that between the plants which at the present time cover the earth, and the animals which inhabit it, and the animals and plants of the later extinct creations, there occurred no break or blank, but that on the contrary many of the existing organisms were contemporary during the morning of their being with many of the extinct ones during the evening of theirs. We know further that not a few of the shells which now live on our coasts, and several of even the wild animals which continue to survive amid our hills and forests, were in existence many ages ere the human age began. Instead of dating their beginning on a single natural day, or at most two natural days, in advance of man, they must have preceded him by many thousands of years. In fine, in consequence of that comparatively recent extension of geological fact in the direction of the later systems and formations through which we are led to know that the present creation was not cut off abruptly from the preceding one, but that on the contrary it dovetailed into it at a thousand different points, we are led also to know, that any scheme of reconciliation which would separate between the recent and the extinct existences by a chaotic gulf of death and darkness is a scheme which no longer meets the necessities of the

case. Though perfectly adequate forty years ago, it has been greatly outgrown by the progress of geological discovery, and is as I have said adequate no longer; and it becomes a not unimportant matter to determine the special scheme which would bring into completest harmony the course of creation, as now ascertained by the geologist, and that brief but sublime narrative of its progress which forms a meet introduction in Holy Writ to the progress of the human family."—pp. 121, 122.

We confess that we see no insuperable force in the objection contained in these words. Admitting that the *probability* would be as above stated, (which is perhaps more than need be admitted,) it cannot be denied on the other hand that there is an obvious possibility of some of the same types of animals being adopted in the recent creation which had existed in previous conditions of the earth. Admitting that the earth has undergone various revolutions and disintegrations,—that at one period of its existence it has been more adapted for the life of one kind of animal, and at another period for another kind, we can see nothing even improbable in the supposition, that some animals should be adapted for two or three of these successive revolutions, and that these should have been reproduced by the Almighty Hand of the Creator in successive periods of the world.

The author of the work* whose title we have placed at

---

* We think it unnecessary to enter into any critical examination of this work. As the production of a self-taught philosopher in the rank of a labouring man, it may be regarded as truly wonderful, and of course abundantly creditable to the author. But, as a work of science it adds little or nothing to the subject on which it mainly treats; and as might be expected, when it touches upon theology it is worse than worthless. It may be scarcely worth while to notice that the author repeats, in very offensive terms, the gross calumny against Archbishop Cullen, which has been already so often refuted. Since Protestants do not scruple still to propagate this falsehood far and wide, we may as well repeat what we have understood to be the real foundation for this very absurd story. It so happened that the name of Archbishop Cullen was advertised, as one of its contributors, on the back of a magazine, which magazine contained a paper, written by some foolish person against the Copernican system. Archbishop Cullen had no more to do with the Paper in question than the Editor of the *Times* has to do with Holloway's Pills,—nay, even less, for he had nothing

the head of this Article, however, deeming the above objection to be fatal, has attempted to revive a theory which was perhaps more prevalent some years ago, namely, that the period called a day in the first chapter of the Book of Genesis is an indefinite period, possibly including thousands of years. In support of this theory he supposes, what indeed has often before been suggested, that the history of the Creation was painted before Moses in vision, and that the successive acts of creation were represented to him as occurring in successive days. We see nothing very improbable in this theory, though the author falls into an absurd mistake when he attempts to support it by referring to the use of the term "day" in Gen. ii. 4. "These are the generations of the heaven and the earth, when they were created in the day that the Lord God made the heaven and the earth." Mr. Miller argues, that as the word "day" here is indefinitely used as inclusive of the whole period of creation; so in the first chapter it may be used with the same indefiniteness. But this is to overlook the very obvious distinction observed in the use of the same terms. If we were to say, 'we are going to York to-day, a journey which would have been impossible in the day when railways were unknown,' it would be absurd to argue that we did not necessarily mean one particular day in the former part of the sentence, because we used the same term indefinitely in the latter part of it. But for our own part, although we see no absolute impossibility in the theory adopted by Mr. Miller, we prefer the one which he rejects, as we have shown, on insufficient grounds.

After all, human knowledge is so limited and defective in these matters, that it is most unsafe to draw positive conclusions from it. Above all, when such conclusions seem to militate against what on other and distinct grounds we know to be absolutely true, we ought to be altogether distrustful of them. We know, for instance, that the Bible is true. We know it on the surest of all grounds, the divine testimony. The conclusions of science

---

whatever to do with the Editorship of the Magazine. Yet on this miserable pretext, having less than the shadow of a foundation, the Archbishop has been again and again accused in Protestant publications of maintaining that the sun travels round the earth.

in many instances, of which geology is certainly one, are but doubtful and imperfect. It is related of some one, that on being shown the shell of some extinct animal, and being asked how it came there, and in that condition, answered, that he supposed God had created it so. We smile at this person's ignorance or simplicity, and yet the answer may suggest to us that we are all fallible in our conclusions. We suppose that it is by much the same kind of reasoning that the philosopher argues that an animal inhabited that shell, and that a grown man was once an infant, and yet we know that once a man existed who had never been a child, and also trees, and herbs, and cattle, and creeping things, which had never known previous growth. Had our philosopher stood by these on the day they were created, he would have concluded by the application of his scientific methods, that they had once been small, and had now grown into their greatness. His philosophy would have been in error. We only offer this observation as suggestive of the uncertainty of human conclusions. We need not say that we ourselves do not mean to question the general conclusions of science, or that we in any way depreciate their pursuit. On the contrary, we are convinced that, by an accumulating force, a more perfect knowledge of all things will lead to the more perfect knowledge of each individual thing. All we pray for is humility and modesty in the pursuit. Let us remember that "we are but of yesterday, and know nothing, because our days upon earth are a shadow." Every step we advance in knowledge opens to us a wider field of things we do not know. As we have already said, we are not surprised that Protestants should be thrown off the balance of their religious opinions by any apparent contradictions of science. They have nothing to rest upon but opinion, and opinion must necessarily be influenced by the greater or less weight of evidence. Private judgment at best is liable to error, and ought always to be open to correction. But the divine testimony is unerring—a faith built upon that is certain, and admits of no change. A Catholic, therefore, rests his religion on a foundation which cannot be shaken, and from this sure footing he can calmly contemplate the advances of science. With him it is no subject of fear that some new discovery may affect the grounds of his religious belief; these are already settled, fixed on a basis which cannot be shaken. Ultimately

science must bear its testimony, if it has any to give, to their truthfulness. In the meanwhile it matters not to him, if the imperfect discoveries of geologists, or of any other philosophers, should seem to militate against the authority of the Bible. He can patiently await the result of more perfect knowledge which is certain to substantiate the faith. "God is true and every man a liar," i. e. every man who, on whatever pretext, contradicts His truth, "That thou mayest be justified in thy words, and overcome when thou art judged." Rom. iii. 4.

ART. VI.—*Messiah; a Sacred Oratorio.* By George Frederick Handel, with an Analysis of the Oratorio. By G. A. Macfarren. London: Published by the Sacred Harmonic Society, at their office, Exeter Hall.

WE must ever regard as among the chief benefactors of a nation those who furnish any class of the community with the means of rational and elevating recreation. To this most important object of public usefulness the Sacred Harmonic Society has largely contributed. The performances which take place under the direction of that body in the great Exeter Hall, at different seasons of the London year, are frequented by large numbers of the middle and upper ranks of society. Although not of many years standing, and consisting mainly in a repetition of the same great master-pieces, these performances appear to be received with undiminished interest and pleasure. Such a result is creditable alike to the Society and to the public. It proves that really good music will always command an English audience; and, now that musical talent and skill are at their height in this country, the fact of any concert or oratorio being well attended, and that too for a constancy, is proof positive that the music provided must be of a high and rare quality.

Exeter Hall, during one of the Advent performances, is a pleasant sight for eyes which find pleasure in the rational recreation of a multitude. Among the numerous

carriages which successively deposit their animated burthens at the door of that famous establishment, there are few perhaps whose dashing appearance and richly emblazoned panels betoken a fashionable whereabout or an aristocratic proprietor. Broughams and cabs preponderate greatly over more splendid equipages; and perhaps you may see more than one omnibus of the many which pour along the Strand, halting to dislodge a well-dressed couple at the door of the Hall. The aspect of the crowded interior soon convinces you, as you have anticipated, that the audience consists mainly of what may be called the domestic society of London; of husbands who prefer their family circle to their club; of wives who know the secret of rendering those circles attractive; of daughters whose sprightly gait and blooming countenances indicate that they do not habitually retire to rest after sunrise; of youths who look happy in the society of their sisters and are not ashamed of being seen in conversation with "the governor," and that even before they have run into debt. Black coats and white cravats abound, and there is a general sobriety of dress and demeanour which imparts almost a religious character to the occasion.

Indeed, among the advantages of these performances, we are disposed to reckon their undeniable effect in ministering to impressions of a really religious nature. If we must make a choice between the morning and the evening entertainments of Exeter Hall, its May meetings and its Advent oratorios, we have no hesitation in saying that, as aids to religion, we give the preference to the latter. It is a far better exercise, say what the world will, to listen for three hours to the words of the Holy Scripture, illustrated by beautiful music, and realized through a semi-dramatic representation, than to spend the same amount of time in hearing clap-trap speeches upon the evils of "Popery" and "Puseyism." There is infinitely more of "the world" in the latter than in the former exhibition; more tendency to vanity, display, and dissipation, to say nothing of more malignant passions. Indeed it is an injustice to the Oratorio even to compare it with the Meeting. The Meeting is a positive evil, and the Oratorio a positive good. The *Messiah* at Exeter Hall is about as religious a thing, taken all in all, as Protestantism can effect in the way of a public attraction. Few sermons that we happen to have heard in the Protestant

church, come up to it, in fact, as a religious exercise. The same is true, though in a less degree, of another of the Exeter Hall favourites. We allude to Mendelssohn's *Elijah*. Many a person has arrived, through that magnificent composition, at a far more accurate idea of the history of the portion of the Old Testament which it illustrates, than he would have gained by the barren perusal of the sacred text, or the inflated declamation of a popular preacher. But all this is truer still of the *Messiah*. That heart must indeed be hardened against all religious emotions, which is not touched by the words of prophecy, and the simple narration of the birth of our Divine Redeemer, clothed, as they have been by our great sacred composer, in strains of such pathetic tenderness and beauty, and especially when heard at the very season which, in itself, calls so vividly to mind the event to which they relate. Indeed it is impossible to witness the rapt attention which the performance of the Messiah invariably commands, with other even less equivocal signs of a religious impression, and not to hope that many a heart, not yet steeled against good by the deadening power of the world, may thus be secretly moved to the love of those beautiful mysteries which are contained in the Life and Death of our Redeemer, and perhaps even be prepared for the teaching of the Catholic Church, by which alone they are made constantly present to the mind and heart of the believer. To Catholics the name and the works of this great musical light of the "Georgian" era, are perhaps less well known than they deserve. Handel flourished under a dynasty and at a period which may not unfitly be termed the golden age of Hanoverian Protestantism. His name is associated with a time at which the true religion smouldered in England under the weight of the most oppressive political influences; and when the bright scintillations of sanctity which it was continually emitting were never suffered to show their light to the world. Yet Handel himself was better than his age. He was, we know, an attentive student of the great masterpieces of the Italian composers, and his own *chef d'œuvre* exhibits more than one indication of a Catholic bias in his art. At any rate, his music, although characteristically belonging to a school of its own, has ministered, in its time, like other productions of real genius, to the cause of the Church; and this alone must give it

an interest in the eyes of those who view the works of the Creator with a really Catholic eye, apart from all the narrowing prejudices of mere sectarianism. For these reasons we have thought that a brief sketch of the history of Handel's greatest Oratorio, and an analysis of its contents might not be uninteresting to those of our readers (and they are not a few) who frequent the oratorios at Exeter Hall, and who would scarcely look, in the unpretending form in which Mr. Macfarren's little book there meets their eye, for the amount of valuable information and intelligent criticism which we hope to show that it contains.

We learn from this interesting guide, that the *Messiah* was completed in the wonderfully short period of twenty-two days from the time of its beginning. The following dates are given in the MSS. preserved at Buckingham Palace, and they appear in Handel's own handwriting. Of the commencement of the oratorio, 22nd of August, 1741; of the conclusion of Part the First, 28th of August; of the conclusion of Part the Second, 6th of September; of the conclusion of Part the Third, 12th of September. There is also reason to believe that the transcription of the work was simultaneous with its composition. It appears that Mozart and some other great composers, were in the habit of forming the plan of their works in their minds before they committed a note to paper. Such, however, was not Handel's practice, as we gather from the fact of the First Part of *Samson* having been completed on the 29th of September, only fifteen days after the *Messiah* had been finished, so that there could have been no time to consider its plan apart from its transcription.

It has been asserted that the *Messiah* was brought out in London without success, previously to its production at Dublin. This statement is disputed, and we think disproved, by Mr. Macfarren. For it appears that Handel was occupied upon the composition of *Samson* till the 29th of October, 1741; yet on the 4th of November of that year it would seem that he must have started for Dublin. He arrived there on the 18th of that month, and must have been at least a fortnight on the way. For besides being detained at Parkgate by contrary winds, he stayed long enough at Chester to quarrel with Mr. Baker, the organist of the cathedral, whose choir undertook to practise some of the chorusses in the Messiah, and broke down in the one

which begins "And with His stripes." All this makes it impossible that Handel could have found time, after completing *Samson*, to arrange a work of such difficulty as the first production of the *Messiah* before he started from London. And accordingly we think Mr. Macfarren has successfully made out his case against the statement of the great Oratorio having failed *before* it was brought out at Dublin. Indeed the very circumstance of Handel having to "prove" his chorusses at Chester is against their having been previously performed in London.

Handel, who appears to have gone to Dublin at the expressed desire of the Lord Lieutenant, began his professional career there by giving two series of musical performances to pave the way, as it were, for his new work. The pieces exhibited on these occasions consisted of *Acis and Galatea, Esther, L'Allegro, Alexander's Feast*, and *Hymen*. These preliminary performances were so successful that the appearance of the *Messiah* was delayed till the April of the following year, 1742. It will be interesting to our readers to be furnished with a copy of the advertisement which announced to the citizens of Dublin the first representation of this celebrated work.

"This day will be performed Mr. Handel's *new* Grand Sacred Oratorio, called THE MESSIAH. The doors will be opened at Eleven and the performance begin at Twelve. The stewards of the Charitable Musical Society request the favour of the Ladies not to come with hoops this day to the Musick Hall in Fishamble Street. The Gentlemen are desired to come without their swords."

"From the latter part of this advertisement," observes Mr. Macfarren, "we may infer that a crowded attendance was expected at the performance." Its success is attested by the following report.

"On Tuesday last, Mr. Handel's sacred grand oratorio, 'the Messiah' was performed in the new Musick Hall in Fishamble Street; the best judges allowed it to be the most finished piece of Musick. Words are wanting to express the exquisite delight it afforded to the admiring crowded audience. The sublime, the grand, and the tender, adapted to the most elevated, majestic and moving words, conspired to transport and charm the ravished Heart and Ear. It is but justice to Mr. Handel that the world should know he generously gave the money arising from this grand Performance, to be equally shared by the Society for relieving Prisoners, the Charitable Infirmary, and Mercers' Hospital, for which they will ever gratefully remember his Name; and that the Gentle-

men of the two Choirs, Mr. Dubourg, Mrs. Avolio, and Mrs. Cibber, who all performed their parts to admiration, acted also on the same disinterested principle, satisfied with the deserved applause of the publick, and the conscious pleasure of promoting such useful and extensive charity. There were above 700 people in the room, and the sum collected for that noble and pious charity amounted to about £400, out of which £127 goes to each of the three great and pious charities."—*Faulkner's Journal*, April 17th. 1742.

The musical celebrities engaged on occasion of this memorable performance were, Signora Avolio, Mrs. Cibber, Mr. Church, and Mr. Rosingrave. The second performance of the *Messiah*, and the last of those which were given during Handel's stay at Dublin, took place on the 29th of May in the same year.

The "Sacred Oratorio," as it now came to be called, *par excellence*, was first performed in London in the Lent of 1743. It was repeated once only during the Lent of that year, entirely suspended during the Lent of 1744, re-produced on the 9th and again on the 11th of April, 1745, and then laid aside till 1750. The rarity of its performance during the first few years of its existence, undoubtedly, as Mr. Macfarren says, gives colour to the prevailing notion of its having been but indifferently received in London, when it did appear, although we think he has convincingly shown that London was not the place of its original production.

It appears that the long interval between the second and third of the London performances of the Messiah was employed by Handel in re-writing certain portions of it which had probably displeased the critical ears of his audience. A week after the first performance in 1745, which appears to have been more or less of the nature of an experiment, the Oratorio was given for the benefit of the Hospital for Exposed Children. From this time of its reproduction Mr. Macfarren considers that we are to date the success of Handel's great work, which was afterwards frequently repeated till the period of the composer's death. On the 6th of April, 1759, the great master presided at the performance of the *Messiah*, and died just one week afterwards, in the midst of the echoes, as we may hope, of those beautiful and soul-stirring words which his genius has illustrated. It is remarkable, and even consolatory, to know that the day on which he was called away was the anniversary of his Redeemer's death—Good

Friday, the 13th of April, 1759. From that time to the present the popularity of the *Messiah* has been continually on the increase, and perhaps was never higher than in the present period of advanced musical criticism.

Of this wonderful success not a little is probably owing to the magnificent instrumentation of Mozart. Handel, it appears, did not write any regular organ accompaniment to his oratorio, and thus left ample scope for the genius of his gifted commentator. It was in 1789, thirty years after Handel's death, that Mozart was employed by the Baron von Swieten to write the extra accompaniments to the Messiah, and we who know the master-work only through their medium, can scarcely judge of what it was in its primitive shape, excepting so far as to know that the illustrator, with an almost religious veneration for his original, has left the basis of the work intact, and concerned himself merely with giving effect to what, with the keen sympathies of musical instinct, he believed to be the intention of the master.

With a theme so unutterably sublime as that which Handel selected for his great oratorio, it must be felt by every one that not to have sunk under its weight, and been absolutely baffled by its splendour, would have been no mean triumph for the genius of poet or musician. Handel did not content himself with any insulated passage in Sacred History, still less with any profane subject, but addressed himself at once to the great mystery of the Incarnation itself, and undertook to illustrate by his art the Advent, Character, Mission, and Sufferings of the Redeemer. In this bold attempt he has not only escaped positive failure, but obtained a measure of success which, with allowance for the extreme difficulty of the work, and the religious disadvantages under which the author laboured, may be pronounced truly wonderful. The effective pathos of the devotional passages, the majestic grandeur of the chorusses, the power of musical illustration brought to bear upon the descriptive portions of the work, and the admirable manner in which the spirit and sentiment of each of its three portions are maintained and mutually contrasted, combine to render the *Messiah* one of the most marvellous productions of human genius which the world has ever seen, and raise it to the rank, as Mr. Macfarren says, of a musical "epic."

We say, deliberately, of "human" genius, for we cannot

subscribe to the opinion of those who trace in Handel's work the tokens of that highest kind of musical inspiration which characterizes works indigenous to the Catholic Church. We understand the meaning of such a term as applied to a Mass of Beethoven's or Cherubini's, to Mozart's *Requiem*, or Pergolesi's "Gloria;" but we feel that it is inapplicable to the *Messiah*, when used of that work in any other sense than that vague and popular one in which it is employed to express anything which is religiously affecting. We do not mean to attribute the absence of religious depth in the *Messiah* to the mere fact of its author being a Protestant, because there are Protestant composers to whom we should not be prepared to deny the praise of that excellence. But whatever be the account of the matter, we feel that there is a difference between Handel's music and that of the Catholic Church, and that this difference is most intelligibly expressed in the distinction we have just drawn.

Our meaning is best illustrated by the analogous case of poetry. Homer and Dante belong to a different order of geniuses from Virgil and Milton, and without any foolish affectation, or any abuse of terms, the order to which Homer and Dante belong may be said to be the diviner of the two. It is more suggestive, more ethical, and therefore deeper. Homer and Dante, and again in a different line, Pindar and Spenser, wrote from the exuberance of minds which naturally see things in the light of genius, and seek rather to give vent to their own overpowering inspirations than to invest a subject in a poetical garb. The latter rather than the former is the characteristic of the Æneid or of Paradise Lost, masterpieces both of poetical *language*, but wanting in the power of native poetry. Virgil and Milton are of the class of poets who write with their readers before them; their earlier masters give one more the idea of speaking in poetry, because they could not speak otherwise.

Now Handel, as we think, belongs to the class of first-rate descriptive, rather than first-rate ethical composers. He is the Virgil of musicians, and more of a dramatist than of a poet. In depth and sentiment he is perhaps excelled by Mendelssohn, yet in the power of decorating his subject he is without a rival. He has carried the art of descriptive music as far as it is capable of being carried without absurdity, and scarcely ever

trenches upon caricature. The pretty chorus in the *Messiah*, "All we like sheep," is, as we feel, one of the few exceptions; and a kind of solecism such as a more simply religious composer would never have committed. In that chorus the author has been deceived by his picturesque habits of mind into overlooking the sentiment in the metaphor; and instead of giving expression to a deeply penitential confession, he has laboured to depict in his composition, a flock of sheep in a state of insubordination. The insertion of this strange piece in the most deeply solemn and pathetic part of the oratorio has always appeared to us a flaw of considerable magnitude. But it is just the kind of mistake into which a writer, whether musician or poet, who consults effect, will be apt to fall, even in spite of himself. Haydn's *Creation*, most beautiful as it is in its own way, offers more than one illustration of the same tendency. The attempt to describe in music the characteristic movements of the different animals, the imitation of the sudden burst of light by a crash of instruments, and of the rising of the sun by a stately march of sounds, are instances of the art which nothing but the brilliancy of the music itself prevents one from feeling to be an absurdity.

But there are comparatively few of such eccentricities in the *Messiah*. Mr. Macfarren, we observe, is disposed to set down the air in the third part, "The trumpet shall sound," among the number. We defer to his criticism rather than feel ourselves able to share it. On the whole the descriptive music of the *Messiah* is of the purest and least exaggerated kind. What, for example, can be more perfect than the illustration of prophetic hope gleaming over confusion and uncertainty in the matchless opening of the oratorio, rising as it does like a spirit of peace out of the billows, from the truly characteristic instrumental piece which introduces it? That little passage in the oratorio which begins with "Comfort ye," and terminates in "And the glory of the Lord," may be said almost to exhaust the sentiments of cheerful hope and pious confidence in their various forms of expression—from the first motions of tranquil relief to the bright anticipation of glorious triumph. Equally striking is the manner in which the sentiment of the last jubilant chorus is followed up by the majestic air which immediately succeeds it, "Thus saith the Lord of Hosts." Indeed, there is no

feature in this wonderful oratorio more remarkable than the felicity of arrangement, the succession of the various parts, as exhibited sometimes in appropriate sequences, sometimes in striking contrasts. Thus the severe grandeur of the description of God's searching counsels under the metaphor of a "refiner's fire" is relieved by the definite prophecy of the "Virgin" who "shall conceive a Son," followed by the lovely song and chorus, "O thou that tellest." This gleam of joy is then overclouded, and next we have the grand song, "Behold darkness." In this most wonderful composition the power of descriptive music is carried to its very utmost perfection. As Mr. Macfarren most justly observes:—

"This is an instance of the composer's power in declamatory recitation, and the air is one of those extraordinary pieces of music in which Handel so eminently excels, *which have the effect, without employing any of the trite, common-place, and indeed burlesque trickery, of technical description, of raising in the mind of the hearer a grand image*," &c.—p. 14.

The chorus which follows, "For unto us," offers another proof of that effect of *relief* in which Handel so preeminently shines. It has been, as it were, signalled in the joyous beauty of prophetic announcement which had come in the song preceding it, "The people.....*have seen a great light.*" What can be more beautiful than the juxtaposition of the words, "For unto us a child is born?" These words are first sung by high treble voices, as of angels, hymning the advent of the Redeemer, and gathering their strength, until at length it attains its climax in the words, "Wonderful, Counsellor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace." Often and often as we have heard this sublime chorus, we never listen to it anew, especially as executed by the magnificent orchestra of the Sacred Harmonic, without emotions of the most thrilling delight. And then, speaking of contrasts, what can be more exquisitely beautiful than the succession to this grand chorus of the sweet pastoral scene of Bethlehem, so majestically, yet so sweetly ushered in by that graceful movement, "the Pastoral Symphony?" We are indebted to Mr. Macfarren for the very interesting information that the melody upon which this Symphony is founded, is that which the Pifferari, or Calabrian Shep-

herds, were accustomed to sing at Christmas before the shrines of Rome.

The words of the Gospel, "And lo! the angel of the Lord," were originally, it appears, set by Handel to an air, but afterwards most judiciously transferred to an accompanied recitative, which is obviously their proper vehicle of expression. The peculiar form of this accompaniment is meant, no doubt, as Mr. Macfarren suggests, to describe the floating of the angels through the air. But another idea has always occurred to us in connexion with the same movement. Those who call to mind the opening of Handel's Coronation Anthem, will remember that almost the same artifice is there employed to express the idea of preparation for a grand solemnity. We have always felt that this too, was in the composer's idea, when he introduces the Angelic Hymn of joy at the Nativity, with the peculiar accompaniment he has assigned to the recital of the narrative.

With great deference to Mr. Macfarren's accomplished taste, we must decline to follow him in his admiration of Handel's rendering of the "Gloria in Excelsis." It strikes us as a very sorry substitute for the productions of our own great Mass-composers. We cannot go along with him in the distinction he draws between the idea of the "Gloria in Excelsis," in the oratorio, and in what he is pleased, in submission to the spirit of Exeter Hall, to term "the Romish Mass." In the Mass, he says, the words to be illustrated contain the exclamation of the worshipping body; in the oratorio they are, on the other hand, historical, and belong to the angels. This strikes us as a "distinction without a difference," because, in the Mass the Gloria in Excelsis is at once representative and historical; a commemoration, time after time, of the first "Gloria" of the Nativity, and a symbol of the angelic worship. It is natural enough that a Protestant critic, on such a subject, should lose sight of this fact, and assign to "the congregation" a more important, or at least exclusive, function in the act of Divine Worship, than that body receives according to the estimate of the Catholic Church.

Moreover, we must remark that Handel himself does not seem to have recognized this distinction, and was indeed too great an admirer of the Italian school of composers to have wished to insulate himself from them. The "And

in earth peace," of his chorus in the *Messiah*, is not an imitation merely, but a simple transcript, of the "Et in terrâ pax" of Pergolesi's celebrated Gloria in Excelsis. But, with the exception of this fine passage, which is not his own, we cannot but feel that Handel's "Glory to God" is a blot in the Messiah, and that it fails just in that point, where a Catholic composer of the same excellence would have succeeded from the very fact of his being a Catholic.

The remainder of the First Part of the Messiah is unexceptionally beautiful. "Rejoice greatly" is in the best style of Handel's jubilant airs, and it is followed by one of the most touchingly pathetic songs in existence, "He shall feed His flock," and its sequel, "Come unto Him." The Part is appropriately concluded by the chorus, "His yoke is easy," a composition singularly fitted, as we feel, to embody the sentiment of its words.

The Second Part of the Messiah is employed upon the illustration of the Passion, Resurrection, and Ascension of our Lord, as well as the establishment and final triumph of His Church. The first of these subjects, the Passion, presents a difficulty to a Protestant illustrator, which even the mighty genius of Handel has failed in our opinion, to surmount. His musical delineation of the Passion is not destitute either of grandeur or pathos, but it fails, where we should have expected it to fail, in sweetness and depth. The opening chorus, "Behold the Lamb of God," is majestic, but ponderous. It is a striking representation of the weight of sin laid upon the Divine Victim of propitiation, but it is not an exhibition of His love. It portrays His oppression rather than man's relief. Of the succeeding air, "He was despised," Mr. Macfarren, with all his admiration of his author, feels that it has "less of character than almost any piece in the oratorio." Next follows a very grand chorus, "Surely He hath borne," in which, however, we still feel the absence of any profound appreciation of the mystery. Let Handel's elucidation of the Passion be compared, for instance, with the Roman music of the "Reproaches," as sung on Good Friday, and our meaning will be plain. The Catholic rendering of the subject has a kind of "languid sweetness" about it which moves you, in spite of yourself, to love and compunction. It is the very counterpart of the Crucifix, and you seem to see through every note the Redeemer of the

world showing you the bitter fruits of your ingratitude, while He offers you free forgiveness as the abundant requital of your love.

Our humble opinion of the next chorus, "All we like sheep," we have already expressed. Here we will only add, that, what strikes us as its singularly flippant character, reflects unpleasantly to our own mind upon the whole of its context. We simply cannot imagine a devout person—at least we cannot imagine a person who had approached towards mastering the Catholic idea of the subject—passing by so sudden a transition to a kind of tripping, fidgetty movement, fitter to accompany the bustle of a harlequinade, than to illustrate the disorganization of the world by sin. We do not deny that apart from its inappropriateness this chorus is exceedingly pretty and effective. Handel, no doubt, intended the solemn passage which follows, "And the Lord laid on Him," &c., to restore the equilibrium, but to our mind the disturbance has been too great for the corrective.

The series of pieces from "All they that see Him," down to "He was cut off," (still with the same allowance for Handel's religious disadvantages,) can scarcely be exceeded for solemn beauty. And in the lovely air, "Thou didst not leave His soul in hell," the composer is himself again, breathes in a more congenial atmosphere, and recovers a tone which is, on the whole, well sustained to the end of this Part of the Oratorio.

The last mentioned air, so full of the hope of the Resurrection, is a most suitable introduction to the exquisite chorus, "Lift up your heads," to our taste, (though not apparently to Mr. Macfarren's,) one of the gems of the oratorio. There is an elegance, a brilliancy, a dramatic life, about this chorus which cannot, as we think, be surpassed. It comes up (and we cannot say more) to the Catholic idea of its subject. Indeed, we know of no music even in the Church so appropriate to the festival of the Ascension as this piece. The opening, "Lift up your heads," assigned to the high voices, the distribution of the question and answer between two choirs, and the union of both in the concluding ascription of glory to the ascended Redeemer, combine to render it as perfect a representation of the celestial welcome of the victorious Prince of Peace as the genius of man has ever produced.

It is a pity that the composer did not close the subject

of the Ascension with this chorus, for the attempt to commemorate the angels' worship of their King is less effective. A short interval, however, of somewhat diminished interest, brings us to the grand portraiture of the preaching of the Gospel on earth; the splendid chorus, "The Lord gave the word," and the delicious contrast offered to it in the song, "How beautiful." Then we have the expressive chorus, "Their sound is gone out," followed by the magnificent bass song, "Why do the heathen," with its equally magnificent instrumental accompaniment. From this we pass to a very fine bit, the bustling chorus, "Let us break their bonds," so effectively relieved by the majestic recitative, "He that dwelleth," and the wonderful air which follows it, "Thou shalt break them." The tone of this passage of the oratorio expresses a kind of contemptuous superiority over the powers of the world, which is as Catholic as it is Scriptural, and the appreciation of which does as much credit to Handel's penetration into the spirit of the sacred text as its expression is honourable to his musical genius.

And thus we are brought, by a suitable course of preparation, to that which is by common consent not merely the great effort of this oratorio, but one of the most marvellous achievements of musical genius which the world has known, the grand Hallelujah Chorus. So simple that a child can feel its power, so grand that even the least gifted hearer must acknowledge its sublimity, yet so artistic that the scientific musician can dilate with enthusiasm upon its merits, this amazing work is one of the few whose reputation has from the first not so much vanquished criticism as kept it at bay.

When the Messiah, on its first performance in London, seemed to pass off heavily, the composer, with a happy intuition, resolved upon transposing the place of the Hallelujah Chorus. It was intended for the concluding piece of the oratorio. Handel, who presided, and felt that matters were going wrong, signified to the performers his wish that the Hallelujah should be given at the end of the Second Part. A few bars only had been executed when the king, (George the Second) who was present, rose from his seat. The whole audience followed the example; the chorus proceeded gallantly upon a tide of enthusiasm, and at the close won not only a triumph for itself, but an immortality of fame for the oratorio. At the end of the

Second Part it has ever since remained, and is never performed before any audience in town or country without receiving the same tribute of homage as on its original production.

The Third and last Part of the oratorio both loses and gains by following instead of introducing the Grand Hallelujah. Such a composition must of necessity give to all which comes after it more or less of the character of a *bathos.* But, on the other hand, it strings up the attention, and conciliates the good will of an audience, and leads them to distrust themselves when inclined to criticize the sequel, rather than to do homage to the composer who has just led them captive. On the whole, however, the Third Part of the Messiah, though with many beauties, is its least attractive portion. Could the composer have managed anyhow to keep up the interest of that first dull audience to the end of the oratorio without this dexterous transposition of the greatest of all its great features, no doubt he would have been preserved from like danger of an anti-climax. The question is, however, whether even the Hallelujah Chorus, had it come at the end of the oratorio, would have triumphed over those impatient movements of the audience which are fatal to the concluding piece of every concert on record. In vain does Mr. Macfarren, with all the earnestness of a sufferer, deprecate the barbarous custom of quashing the final piece with the sounds of busy departure. For what is after all to be done? The only way to escape a crowd in a place of public amusement is to anticipate it, and we apprehend that those who love music more than they hate a squeeze, will always form the minority at least in an English audience. Hence it is a relief to all the sons of harmony to secure the Hallelujah Chorus at least, not only from the effects, but even from the apprehension, of any such disturbance, and thus we are glad that it crowns the Second Part of the Messiah even at the expense of the Third.

It must be acknowledged, as Mr. Macfarren observes, that Handel has shown great skill in the opening air of the Third Part, "I know that my Redeemer liveth." It is a sweet reposeful piece, and as such not only the best, but the only suitable sequel to one of such surpassing grandeur as that whose echoes it displaces. The Quartettsand Chorusses which follow it, "Since by man came death,"

&c., are extremely effective as an illustration of the sentiment, and whether it be from early association, or any other simply personal cause, or, on the other hand from any quality in the piece itself, so it is, that we are unable to adopt Mr. Macfarren's unfavourable judgment of the next Recitative, and Air, "Behold, I show you a mystery," and "The trumpet shall sound," a passage which always affects us with very sensible emotion, so far as that may be any criterion of its power. And now the attention has passed its zenith, and we tolerate rather than drink in the two or three remaining pieces, which bring us to the fine concluding chorus "Worthy is the Lamb," a composition no doubt of the highest musical excellence, but which, whether from its close juxtaposition to the Hallelujah, or from being indissolubly associated in our minds with the rustling of petticoats, and the interchange of curtsies, always seems to us to do inadequate justice to its unutterably solemn and majestic words.

Thus ends the great oratorio, the most precious by far of the contributions which the art of music has made to the cause of religion, out of the Church of God. As such, it belongs, like all else which is rare and beautiful, to the use of that Church, and she does not disdain to employ it for the ends which she alone has been commissioned to carry out, any more than she despises classical poetry, or the works of painters who have illustrated holy subjects by the light of the genius which God has bestowed upon them, though debarred from the knowledge of that religion which is the true soul of art as it is in all things the only measure of the beautiful, because also of the true and the good. The *Messiah* of Handel, while separated by a wide gulf from the native music of the Church, as much as from the sacred compositions of those who, without being actually Catholics, have lived in Catholic countries and so caught some of her floating inspirations, has beauties of its own kind, and such as perhaps belong to it peculiarly as an extra-Catholic work. For that may be true of Sacred Music which has been said of Sacred Poetry, that they who are outside the Church have some advantages even over such as are within her pale towards illustrating what belongs to her. What they want in the power of appropriating her truths they sometimes exhibit in that of describing her exterior form and attributes. We catch the spirit of a city by living within it, but form a better

idea of its appearance by regarding it from without. Hence it is that, perhaps, not even a Catholic could so effectively have represented in musical colours the mere narrative of the sacred text as this great Protestant artist has done; for devout Catholics would have been engaged in mastering the spirit, where he has illustrated the details. They would have spoken of the abundance of the heart to the like-minded; he has surveyed the work with a critic's eye, and delineated it for the benefit of the world. There are persons, and they even skilful musicians, to whom some movement of the Ecclesiastical Chant, the Kyrie, for instance, of the Requiem Mass, or the "Dies Iræ," or the "Ave Maris Stella," or the tones of some of the Antiphons, constitute far richer melody than any piece in the *Messiah;* but to the ordinary run of musical ears these strains would produce no sentiment but that of weariness and perhaps disgust.

Even the Hallelujah chorus belongs to the same class of descriptive music, though in its very highest range. It takes a bolder flight in the same province, but it does not belong to a different order. It is depictive, not expressive, but has for its subject, not the earthly humiliations of the Redeemer, but the future triumphs of His reign. From first to last the Messiah is a picture taken from outside the Church, not an outpouring of thought from within.

Yet that author, be he who he may, does good service to religion who employs in its behalf an agent so powerful as the art of music, and especially he who uses that art in illustrating the text of scripture even in its unauthorized form. Could we only get Protestants to turn the faculties of the imagination God-wards, we should have gained a considerable step towards their preparation for the Truth. The imagination is the very handmaid of Faith, whose interest it is of the last consequence to obtain on her side. It is that dull heavy pounding of didactic prose into the reluctant ears of people, week after week, from the pulpits of the land which is at the root of the national irreligion. "Preaching and preaching," as the *Times* calls it, is the way to empty churches, and judging from the opinions of the world as represented on the surface of that truth-telling mirror, the experiment is answering the purposes of its author. Hence it is that we turn with relief to any method, however simply recreative, which gives the imagination something innocent to feed

upon; and with more than relief—with absolute thankfulness—to a taste like that for sacred music, which secures that, to a certain number of minds in England, the beautiful words of the Evangelists shall be brought home, through the medium of that art which, more than any other, has the gift of moulding the soul according to the bent of its own character, and the subject with which it is engaged.

ART. VII.—1. *Corpus Ignatianum.* A complete Collection of the Ignatian Epistles, genuine, interpolated, and spurious. By William Cureton, M.A.F.R.S. London, 1849.

2. *Patrum Apostolicorum Opera*, edidit Carolus Josephus Hefele. Tubingae, 1855.

FEW monuments of the early Church can claim an equal interest in Christian controversy, with the letters of St. Ignatius. Their number, the occasion to which they owed their origin, the saintly bishop who dictated them, the clear outlines which he draws between heresy and orthodoxy, the precision with which he determines the constitution of the Christian Church, and the many incidental doctrines which he illustrates, at once declare the merit of these epistles, and the debt which we owe to our forefathers in the faith for having handed down to us this sacred treasure.

On the first publication of the Medicean text, many, carried away by the ardour of theological discussion, sought to controvert the genuineness of these letters; but, for the past one hundred and fifty years, all controversy seemed to have been hushed in their regard. Each difficulty had been answered a thousand times, and even the most incredulous had been compelled to yield before the overwhelming weight of evidence which authenticated their true origin. The sacred fire which animates the writer, the desire of martyrdom ever recurring in these letters, and the heavenly ardour which they breathe, as

well as the peculiar forms of expression which are met at every page, and the very errors which are combated, seemed to proclaim as their author the martyred Bishop of Antioch. Moreover it was not only handed down to us by the most ancient writers that this holy Bishop had written many letters, but their number was accurately defined, whilst long extracts quoted from them in the same early monuments supplied sufficient data for establishing beyond cavil that the true letters of St. Ignatius were those treasured up in the famous Medicean manuscript.

Several writers, however, of the past few years, relying principally on some lately discovered Syriac manuscripts, have again attempted to revive the controversy as to the genuineness of these letters.

The most celebrated work which has appeared, thus controverting the genuineness of the Medicean text, is that of Mr. Cureton, mentioned at the head of this Article. This 'Corpus Ignatianum' presents a Syriac text of three epistles of our Saint, much shorter than those hitherto attributed to him; and the special object of Mr. Cureton is, to establish that these three letters are alone the genuine work of St. Ignatius—an assertion which involves two conclusions, 1st, that only three of the many letters attributed to our Saint can be admitted as genuine; and 2nd, that the abreviated Syriac text presents the true form of these three letters.

The history of the discovery of these Syriac letters is now too well known to be more than alluded to. In the year 1839, Mr. Tattam, travelling through the East, acquired from the monastery of St. Mary Deipara, situated in the desert of Nitria, many very ancient Syriac manuscripts, amongst which were found "not only several extracts from the Ignatian epistles, cited by different ecclesiastical writers, but also the entire epistle to St. Polycarp, in a volume of great antiquity." (Cureton, Introduct. xxvi. seq.) In 1842 Tattam set out a second time for Egypt in quest of manuscripts, and being crowned with complete success, he returned in March, 1843, bearing with him as the fruits of his labours, between three and four hundred volumes, from the same monastery in the valley of Scete. Amongst these Mr. Cureton discovered three letters of Ignatius, to St. Polycarp, to the Ephesians, and to the Romans. (Ibid xxviii.) M. Auguste Pacho, in 1847, became possessor of the remaining manu-

scripts of the monastery of St. Mary, and on these being acquired by the British Museum, another Syriac copy was found of the same three epistles of our Saint. These remains of the Syriac version of the letters of St. Ignatius were not the only treasures with which the literary world was enriched, through the enterprise and research of these illustrious travellers. The festal letters of St. Athanasius were a valuable addition to our patristic store; many other fragments have been published in the 'Spicilegium' of the Fathers of Solesme, whilst Dr. Pertz, the diligent explorer of Dresden, was rewarded by the discovery of a classical historian of the Augustan age.

Before we examine the theory which Mr. Cureton adopts, we must say a word on the advantages which have accrued to the criticism of the Ignatian text from the discovery of these fragments of the ancient Syriac version; another example of the happy results to Catholic controversy which ever ensue, not only from the discovery of new records of the early Church, but also from each fresh illustration which philological research supplies in reference to the already explored ancient monuments.

Let us take for instance the doctrine of St. Ignatius, regarding the Blessed Eucharist. Though many passages of his letters had clearly declared his faith in the real presence of the Body and Blood of the Redeemer in this most holy Sacrament, yet the opponents of Catholic teaching fondly clung to one passage of the epistle to the Romans as sufficient to counterbalance all the other testimonies of our Saint. It was of no avail that in the epistle to the Smyrneans, after having pointed out the excesses into which the heretics had fallen in consequence of their erroneous doctrines, he had added, "They abstain from the Eucharist and from the Sacrifice (Ευχαριστίας και προσφόρας* ἀπέχονται) because they do not confess the Eucharist to be the flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ, that flesh, in truth, which suffered for our sins, and which in His goodness the Father resuscitated δια το μη ὁμολόγειν την ἐυχαριστίαν σαρκα

* We have used the word προσφόρας as it is presented by Theodoret in his citation of this passage. The word προσευχη of the Medicean text is, however, equivalent, as Cotelerius (Patt. App. tom. 2. part. 1. pag. 36. not. 3.) very clearly demonstrates.

εἶναι του Σωτηρος ἡμων Ιησου Χριστου, την ὑπερ των ἁμαρτίων ἡμων παθουσαν, ἣν τῃ χρηστοτητι ο Πατηρ ἠγειρεν. We may incidentally remark that this beautiful passage in which the denial of the Eucharist being the very flesh of Jesus Christ, is declared to be at once repugnant to Christian feelings, and contrary to what God has taught, is cited in extenso from our Saint by Theodoret, in his 3rd Dialogue (edit. Sirmondi. vol. iv. pag. 154. D.)

In the words which are immediately subjoined, St. Ignatius continues to declare the excellence of this gift of God, it being the bond of charity amongst Christians, maintaining in their souls the life of grace, and entitling the body to the privilege of a glorious resurrection: "Those who reject this gift of God," he writes, "being torn by dissensions and conflicting doctrines, become subject to eternal death. It were better for them to make it the object of their love that they may inherit the Resurrection." In like manner in the epistle to the Ephesians, chap xx., the Blessed Eucharist is styled the source of immortality, the antidote against death, and communicating to us eternal life in Jesus Christ." ἀθανασίας ἀντιδοτος του μη ἀποθανειν, ἀλλα ζην εν I. X. δια παντος. Again, in the epistle to the Philadelphians, chap. iv., he exhorts them not to be led astray by heresy, lest they lose the inheritance of the kingdom of God, but "to use one Eucharist, for one is the flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ, and one the chalice, unto a union with His Blood; one the altar, as one is the bishop," &c. And thus too he elsewhere declares that the deacons are the dispensers of the mysteries of Jesus Christ (μυστήριων Ἰησου Χριστου); and that whosoever is cut off from the altar (θυσιαστήριον) is deprived of the bread of God (ad Trallian. ch. 2.).

One passage, however, from the 7th chapter of the letter to the Romans, seemed at first sight to favour a contrary doctrine; and this was vauntingly advanced by many patrons of the Protestant cause, as wholly conclusive against the belief of St. Ignatius in the real presence of our Lord in the holy Sacrament of the Altar. This passage thus runs in the Ignatian text: "I cherish not the corruptible food and the pleasures of this world. I wish the bread of God, the heavenly bread, the bread of life, which is the flesh of Jesus Christ; and I wish the drink of God, His Blood, which is the incorruptible love, and

life eternal."* Indeed, the Catholic apologist might well contend that there was nothing in these words repugnant to the whole tenor of St. Ignatius's teaching, and to the doctrine of the Real Presence; for truly are the Body and Blood of our Lord in the holy Sacrament the pledge and source and communication, so to say, of His ever-subsisting love, and of eternal life. But any reasoning of our adversaries, based on this text, was manifestly fallacious. The reading of the text was itself uncertain, some of the most important manuscripts omitting altogether the words το αἷμα ἄντου, whilst others presented equally important variations.† Jacobson, resting on the internal evidence of the text, hesitated not to write in the early editions of his 'Patres Apostolici,' "multa hic, quæ occurrunt quoque apud Metaphrasin, et in vulgatis codicibus, manifestam sapiunt interpolationem." Neither was there any agreement as to the interpretation which should be given to these words of St. Ignatius; and whilst many, with Grabe, referred them to the Blessed Eucharist, others, even amongst the opponents of the Catholic doctrine, concluded with Usher that the whole passage referred only to the eternal fruition of God, and to the beatific vision enjoyed by the blessed souls.

The Syriac version alone reconciles these conflicting opinions, and points out the origin of the various readings which afterwards crept into the text; whilst at the same time the whole passage becomes more clearly consistent with the teaching of our Saint, and we need not add, with the Catholic doctrine in regard of the Blessed Eucharist. It presents the text thus: "The food of corruption has no attractions for me, nor have the delights of this world. The food of God do I desire, which is the flesh of Christ, and His Blood. As drink I desire the charity which is incorruptible." In this all is coherent. In the preceding passage St. Ignatius had declared that the prince of this world sought to bear him away captive, and destroy in him the faith which was unto God; but that he looked only to His love who had been crucified, and all his affections were centred in *Him*. In the present words he

---

* Και πόμα θέου θελω, το αἷμα ἄντου ὁ ἔστιν ἄγαπη αφθάρτος και ἀεννάος ζωη.

† See Usher's edition of these epistles, page 38, not. 84.

renews the same sentiment, and declares that he rejects the *food* of corruption and the *delights* of this world, whilst Jesus Christ is the only object of his desire and love, as *food* in the Holy Eucharist, where he receives *His true Body and Blood;* and as his *beatitude*, when hereafter he should enjoy His unveiled presence in that bliss which is eternal. Thus, far from this passage being repugnant to the doctrine elsewhere propounded by our Saint, it is seen to be wholly in conformity with it, and presents in the clearest manner the belief of the Catholic Church regarding the most Holy Sacrament of the Altar.

Another passage in the 8th chap. to the Trallians, which seemed hitherto wholly unintelligible, receives a like illustration from the fragments of the ancient Syriac version, which are preserved in the manuscript of St. Germain de Pres, to which we shall have occasion a little further on to refer more fully; it now reads as follows: "You, therefore, clothing yourselves with meekness, be regenerated in that faith, which is in the hope and the enjoyment of the Blood of Jesus Christ."

Before abandoning this subject, the 3rd chapter of the epistle to the Smyrneans deserves our attention. Speaking of the Redeemer manifesting Himself to the Apostles after His Resurrection, he says: "they touched Him and believed, κραθέντες τη σάρκι ἄυτου και τῳ πνεύματι." The common interpretation of these words, "*convinced* by his flesh and spirit," substituted κρατηθεντες instead of κραθέντες, but Dr. Hefele very justly insists on the ancient reading being preserved, and translates the passage, "being commingled with His flesh and spirit," *commixti carne ejus et spiritu.* It seems to us that the Armenian version of the Ignatian letters, as published by Petermann alone, presents the true meaning of this passage, and gives us the key to the ancient reading of the text, and to its subsequent alteration, "having partaken of the holy Supper, and enjoyed His Body and Blood," thus reading κραθέντες τη σάρκι ἄυτου και τῳ αιματι, which latter word was easily changed by later copyists into the πνευματι of the present text. Thus we have three new testimonies of St. Ignatius illustrating his Catholic faith in the sacrament of the Eucharist. So is it also in regard of other doctrines.

The title of the epistle of St. Ignatius to the Romans has always been deemed illustrative of the high dignity and

special privileges of the holy See. Indeed, our Saint, in a manner altogether peculiar to this epistle, bursts forth at once into an address replete with the most glowing epithets of admiration and love. He styles it "the Church beloved and illumined by the decree of Him who wills all things according to the love of Jesus Christ, our God,—the Church, which presides in Rome, worthy of God..... presiding in charity (προκαθημένη της ἀγαπης) bearing aloft (as its standard) the law of Christ, and sealed with the name of the Father." We have translated the phrase προκαθημένη της ἀγαπης in conformity with the meaning commonly assigned to it; but Hefele happily illustrates it as implying "presiding over all the faithful," that is, all who are bound together in the unity of faith, and with the bonds of Christian charity. It is by a similarly constructed formula that John of Antioch expresses the pre-eminence of his See in the East προκαθημένη της ἀνατόλης; and St. Gregory of Nazianzen in like manner styles Constantinople προκαθεζομένη της ἑωας πολις that is, 'Capital of the Eastern world.'* The Syriac text compendiates the title of this epistle, but still retains the whole force and emphasis of the original. Thus we find it designating Rome as the See that holds the place of dignity and authority (dejithbo berisho); whilst the many concluding loving salutations of the Greek text are all well compendiated in the simple words which style it, "the Church *perfected in the law of Christ.*"

The 18th chapter of the epistle to the Ephesians presents the passage περιψήμα το εμον πνευμα του σταυρου which was literally translated in the Latin version "purgamentum meus spiritus est crucis;" but interpreters had never hitherto been able to assign a definite meaning to these words, or one which would be in accordance with the context in which they occur. Here the Syriac text once more comes to our aid, and interprets this passage in a manner most coherent, not only with the words which precede, but also with those which follow, "my spirit boweth down, adoring (sagdeh) the cross, which is a scandal to those who believe not, but to us salvation and life eternal." The transla-

* And hence the formula of our Saint must imply in like manner that Rome is the true centre and presiding city of the Christian world.

tor must consequently have found in his copy of the Greek epistles the word προσκυνήμα or προσκύνει instead of the present reading περιψήμα, to which indeed the transition was easy through error of the copyists. The reading of the Syriac version is, moreover, corroborated by the Armenian translation, which presents the text in like manner, "My spirit adores the cross," &c. Indeed, this formula seems to have been of frequent use in the Syriac Church, and we find it more than once recurring in the works of St. Ephrem. Thus, (tom. 3. opp. Syriac, pag. 494. edit. Assemanni,) in his 38th paramesis, he says: "Though I am unworthy to obtain pardon for my sins, yet do I implore it from Thee, as in Thy boundless love Thou hast nourished me with Thy Body, and mingled Thy Blood through my members, and I have loved Thee according to my strength; and I have suppliantly adored Thy cross, as was meet," &c; and in the same page, a few sentences before, he had already said, "Free Thy Spouse, O Lord, from every stain, because with veneration I embrace Thy cross," &c.

In the 5th chapter of the epistle to St. Polycarp we find the words, "If any one be able to continue in chastity in honour of Him who is the Lord of the flesh, let him in humility continue so:" but whilst the Greek text thus runs, εἰς τίμην του κυρίου της σάρκος, the Syriac and Armenian versions present a different construction, having read, εἰς τιμην της σάρκος του Κυριου and translate the whole passage "If anyone be able to remain in chastity *in honour of the flesh of our Lord*, let him do so in humility," &c.

Many other passages receive a like illustration from the Syriac text. Thus, the concluding words of the 3rd chapter to the Romans, somewhat obscure in their Greek form, receive their full force from the Syrian translator. Our Saint is speaking of the glory of martyrdom, which redounds not to him who suffers, but to our Lord Jesus Christ and His religion; and he adds the reason, "for the Christian religion is not a work of reasoning, but is truly great, especially when combated by the world." The hitherto ambiguous phrase in the 6th chapter of the same epistle τοκετος μοι ἐπικείται has its meaning also fixed: "The pains of childbirth are at hand for me," that is of martyrdom, to which the joy of birth to an eternal life should succeed.

We may add another example to show what light philo-

logical and critical research may shed on the controverted passages of ancient writers. The words of our Saint in the eighth chapter to the Philadelphians, declare his reverence for the Holy Scriptures, but many moreover appealed to them as presenting the Sacred Scripture as the only source of divine truth to us. The whole passage runs thus: "Επει ἤχουσα τινων λεγοντων, ὁτι ἐαν μη ἐν τοις ἀρχαιοις ἑυρω ἐν τω ἐυαγγελιῳ ὁυ πιστευω· και λεγοντος μου ἀυτοις, ὅτι γεγράπται, ἀπεκριθησαν μοι ὅτι προκείται. "I have heard some to say that if we find it not in the ancient (writings) we will not believe in the Gospel; and I saying to them, that it is written, they answer me, προκείται." Let these words be interpreted as you please, we cannot see how they can be made to imply the meaning that the Scriptures are the only source of truth. But to understand them fully we must hold in mind that our Saint here disputes against those heretics from the Jews who would fain reject every doctrine not propounded in the Scriptures of the Old Law. This indeed was only an assumed mask precisely as the cry to Scripture is with many at the present day; and when the Christian apologists declared that the Christian law was a true fulfilment of the ancient prophecies, they had recourse to new evasions, ever demanding new investigations, new proofs. This line of conduct of the early Judaizing Christians may especially be learned from the writings of St. Justin. In his dialogue with Tryphon he introduces them demanding proofs from the Scriptures of the Jewish Law; and when he had proposed many arguments from them, he adds that he knows well that such reasoning will be of no avail with his adversaries, for at one time they answer, μη ὕυτω γεγραπται, "it is not thus in the Scripture;" at another, that "the interpretation given was erroneous," or again had recourse to a thousand other reasonings to evade the conclusions in favour of truth. (See chapters 57, 68, and 71.) Hence precisely as St. Ignatius, in the words immediately preceding those cited above, had exhorted the faithful to shun these contentious heretics; and μήδεν καθ' ἐριθείαν πράσσειν, so too St. Justin in the same Dialogue more than once refers to this contentious desire of reasoning as characteristic of the Judaizing heretics; and in chapter 64 they are styled φιλερέστοι και κένοι, whilst their special object is declared to be φιλερέστειν και φιλονείκειν.

The answer προκείται, which is commemorated by St. Ignatius in the passage already cited, has received a great

variety of interpretations. Hefele, we think, has happily interpreted it, "this it is that must be proved," *hoc demonstrandum est.* That the word admits this meaning is manifest from the "Thesaurus" of Henricus Stephanus; and such a meaning is wholly coherent with the context and with the manner of answering adopted by the Jews, as we have learned from St. Justin. At the same time it must be no less manifest that the other various interpretations are incompatible with the true force of the word and with the subject matter of discourse. Thus, for instance, when Holstein translates it, "id omnibus patere;" and when Routh suposes it equivalent to "it is an addition to the genuine Scriptures."

But whatsoever interpretation we may choose for this phrase, it must be sufficiently manifest, that disputing against such heretics, and endeavouring to establish the fulfilment of the ancient prophecies in the facts commemorated in the Scriptures of the New Testament, St. Ignatius supplies no argument for that extreme doctrine advanced by our adversaries, to which we have alluded above. Rather should we attend to the beautiful words with which our Saint concludes the passage already cited: "To me Jesus Christ is the true authority; and unvarying principles are His cross, and death, and resurrection, and the faith which is through Him, in all which I hope to be justified through your prayers." Thus instead of that contentious reasoning which has ever been a characteristic mark of heresy, St. Ignatius declares that *the living faith*, that is, the ever-unchanging teaching of the Church, inaugurated by the Redeemer, and sealed by the glory of His resurrection, is the true divinely constituted principle for communicating the heavenly truths to us.

There is another feature in the lately-discovered Syriac works to which we may also refer. Many deemed the frequent recurrence in the ancient monuments of the title θεος, θεος ημων, in reference to our blessed Saviour, additions of a later hand, and made the frequent repetition of this title in the letters of St. Ignatius, a special ground for impugning their authenticity. But they will surely be surprised to find that the Syriac text addresses our Saviour in the same manner, and often too retains these words where they had been omitted by later Greek copyists; for instance, in the concluding salutation of the Epistle to the Romans, "Farewell in the patience of Jesus

Christ *our God.*" In like manner a Syriac fragment of the letter of St. Polycarp, to the Philippians, given in the appendix to the "Corpus Ignatianum," retains this title, whilst it is omitted in the Greek text: "But God and the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the chief Priest of eternity Himself, *God Jesus Christ,* build you up in faith and truth," &c. This reading is also found in Severus of Antioch. (Ap. Cureton, "Corp. Ignat." p. 215.)

Mr. Cureton, in his Introduction, collects the principal passages from the three epistles in which this title is given to our Saviour.

"Thus, from the Epistle to the Ephesians, εν σαρκι γενομενος θεος (ch. 7); Ὁ γαρ Θεος ἡμων Ιησους ὁ Χριστος (ch. 18). Again in the last chapter of the Epistle to St. Polycarp: εν θεω ημων Ιησω Χριστω, and further in the Epistle to the Romans, in the inscription, Ιησου Χρίστου του θεου ἡμων, εν Ιησω Χριστω τῳ θεῳ ἡμων; and Ὁ γαρ θεος ἡμων Ιησους Χριστος (ch. 3), ἐπιτρεψατε μοι μιμήτην ἐιναι του πάθυς του Θεου μου, (ch. 6.) in all of which the doctrine of the Godhead of our blessed Lord is especially mentioned."

But wholly irrespective of this title of supreme Lord and God, with which our Saint loves so frequently to address our Saviour, there are many other expressions yet retained even in the Syriac epistles, which imply in like manner His divinity and Godhead.

"For example, in the Epistle to Polycarp: Τον ὑπερ καιρον προσδοκα, τον ἄχρονον, τον ἀορατον, τον δι' ἡμας ὁρατον, τον ἀψηλαφητον, τον ἄπαθη, τον δι' ἡμας ἀπαθητον, τον κατα παντα τροπον δι ἡμας υπομεινοντα. In the same epistle ἐις το θεου ἐπιτυχειν; and in the Epistle to the Romans, δυσκολον ἐστιν του θεου ἐπιτυχειν and καιρον τοιουτον θεου ἐπιτυχειν, δι' ὧν ἐνεστιν θεου ἐπιτυχειν, compared with ἵνα Ιησου Χριστου ἐ τιτυχω, and μονον ἵνα Ιησου Χριστου ἐπιτυχω, of the same epistle. Again in the Epistle to the Ephesians, μιμήται ὄντες θεου compared with μιμήται δε του Χριστου in the same epistle. Also in the Epistle to the Ephesians, μαθητης ἔιναι θεου, with ἔσομαι μαθητης ἀληθως Ιησου Χριστου of the Epistle to the Romans. Further in the Epistle to the Romans: Καλον το δυναι ἄπο του κοσμου εις θεον, ἵνα ἐις ἄυτον ἀνατειλω, compared with αλλ ἔαν παθω ἀπελευθερος γενησομαι Ιησου Χριστου, και ἀναστησομαι ἐν ἄυτῳ ἐλευθερος, and with ινα κρειττονος ἐλευθεριας ἀπο θεου τυχωσιν of the Epistle to St. Polycarp. Again, in the Epistle to the Ephesians, we have directly ἐν ἅιματι θεου." (Corp. Ignatianum, Introduct. xxxvi. xxxviii.)

But it is time we should return to the main subject of this Article. Is then Mr. Cureton justified in his twofold assertion, that only three letters were in fact written by

St. Ignatius, and that the Syriac version, as met with in the Nitrian manuscripts, presents the complete text of these three letters? Any one who duly weighs the arguments adduced by Hefele in the Introduction to his 'Patres Apostolici,' must rest convinced that both assertions are untenable, and that the Nitrian letters are only *three* of the many written by our Saint, whilst even these three are incomplete, being mere extracts from the genuine epistles, which were made perhaps in some Eastern monastery for the special ascetic use either of the individual who transcribed them, or of the monastery to which he belonged.

In the first place the whole weight of extrinsic authority is opposed to the theory of Mr. Cureton. In questions of critical investigation regarding the early Church, no writer bears with him greater authority than that of the learned Eusebius, Bishop of Cesarea. Removed only by two hundred years from the Apostolic times, and being attached to the imperial court, and having at his command all the literary treatises of the Cesarean library, he ever displays a profound knowledge of the earlier Christian writers, and at the same time a truly refined critical acumen in discriminating between their genuine productions and those falsely assigned to them. Now it is precisely this Eusebius who is most particular in handing down to us the number of the Ignatian epistles, and who, moreover, supplies most data for determining their identity.

The importance of his testimony will, we are sure, justify the length of the following extract from his Eccles. Hist. Book 3rd. chap. 36.

"And Ignatius, who even to this day is renowned by many, was the second Bishop in the Church of Antioch after Peter. But an account is told respecting him, that he was sent from Syria to the city of Rome, and was devoured by beasts for the sake of the testimony for Christ. When therefore he was passing through Asia, and was watched with much caution by the guards who kept him, he confirmed the cities into which he entered with words of consolation and encouragement; and more especially he exhorted them that they should first of all be on their guard against heresies, because that then they were already abundant; and he entreated them not to depart from the tradition of the Apostles. And for the greater caution he determined to testify to them also by writing. And when he was come to Smyrna, where Polycarp was, he wrote one epistle to the Church of Ephesus, and mentions that they had a pastor, Onesimus: and another to the city of Magnesia, which is

on the side of the river Menandrus, in which also he mentions that there was a Bishop there whose name was Damas: and again another to the city Tralles, and he writes that there was there a chief whose name was Polibius. And besides these he also wrote to the Church of Rome, and presented in it a request to them that they would not beg off his martyrdom, and deprive him of the hope which he loved. From which it is right that we should set down a few things for a proof of what has been said. He wrote them in his words thus: 'From Syria even to Rome I contend with beasts by sea and by land, by night and by day, being bound with ten leopards, which are the band of soldiers, who when we do good to them, they do evil: and by their evil treatment I become more a disciple; but not on this account am I justified to myself. I salute the beasts which are prepared for me, and I pray that they may be quickly found for me, and I will provoke them to devour me speedily; not as that which is afraid of others, and does not approach them: for even if they should refrain, and not be willing to approach me, I will go with violence against them. Know me from myself. What is expedient for me I know. Now I begin to be a disciple. Let nothing envy me of those that are seen and of those that are not seen, that I should be accounted worthy of Jesus Christ. Fire and the cross, and the collection of beasts, and scattering of the bones, and amputations of the limbs, and destruction of the whole body, and the torment of Satan, let all these come upon me, and only may I be accounted worthy of Jesus Christ.' And these epistles he wrote from that city of which we have spoken to those Churches which we have enumerated. When then they had passed Smyrna he wrote again from Troas to those who were in Philadelphia, and to the Church of Smyrna, but personally to the bishop there, Polycarp, whom he knew to be an imitator of the Apostles, and like a good and true Pastor, he commended to him his flock in Antioch, and persuaded him to take care of it with diligence."*

Thus, then, Eusebius expressly mentions the seven letters of St. Ignatius, and with his characteristic precision supplies sufficient data for determining the genuine text of these letters. Applying these data to the Syriac letters, we must conclude that they do not retain the complete text even of the three letters which they present. Thus, the reference to the Church of Antioch, expressly men-

* The translation of this passage is made from the Syriac version of the Eccles. Hist. of Eusebius, and the corresponding Syriac extract may be seen in the appendix of the "Corpus Ignatianum," p. 202 seq.

tioned by Eusebius, is omitted in the Syriac letter to St. Polycarp, whilst it is found in the Greek text; and the long extract from the letter to the Romans, which precisely agrees with the revived Greek text, gives one passage omitted in the Nitrian version.

This same Eusebius, in another work entitled "Quæstiones ad Stephanum," published by Cardinal Mai in his 'Scriptorum Veterum Nova Collectio,' (vol. i. p. 2.) cites a passage from the 19th chapter to the Ephesians, which, in like manner is found to agree only with the Greek text.

But Eusebius is not the only ancient writer who thus stands forth a witness to the number and genuine text of the Ignatian letters. In the fifth century, Theodoret, whilst he numbers our Saint amongst the special defenders of the faith, (vid. ep. 89. ad Florent., and ep. 145, ad Monachos Constantin.) and styles him (in ep. 151.) Ὁ πολυθρυλλήτος ὁ δία της του μεγαλου Πετρου δεξίας την ἀρχιερωσυνην δεξαμένος cites long passages from the Epistles to the Smyrneans and Trallians, and moreover presents extracts from the letter to the Ephesians, which are omitted in the Nitrian version, but are in perfect conformity with the Greek text.

St. Jerome, in like manner disputing against Helvidius, numbers first amongst the Fathers whose writings were directed against heresy, St. Ignatius, and citing from his letters, in the work 'de viris illust.,' gives some passages not met with in the Syriac text. Thus, too, St. Athanasius, in a dogmatic treatise against the Arians, cites from the 7th chapter to the Ephesians, the famous passage: εἷς ἰατρος εστι, σάρκικος και πνευμάτικος, &c., which words seem indeed to have become proverbial in the Church, and are reproduced by Theodoret and Gelasius, and no fewer than three times in the Syriac fragments, which are found in the Appendix of the "Corpus Ignatianum." Nevertheless, this passage is one of those omitted in the Nitrian letters.

St. Ephrem, the illustrious Doctor of the Eastern Church, and glory of the See of Antioch, is another important witness against the claim of Mr. Cureton's text, as he refers in his writings to the epistle of our Saint, addressed to the Church of Smyrna, as we learn from Photius. (See his 'Bibliotheca' codice 229.) Even in the 2nd century we find another distinguished ornament of

that see, St. Theophilus, agreeing in his citations, not with the Syriac, but with the Medicean text. Now these illustrious writers of the See of Antioch, must surely have expressed the tradition of that Church, and inherited the genuine epistles of their glorious martyred predecessor.

And what shall we say of St. Polycarp, the bosom friend of our Saint, and his fellow bishop, to whom, too, one of his loving letters is addressed? The testimony of this Saint in regard of the Ignatian letters, presents two different readings, both however equally important, and alike opposed to the theory of Mr. Cureton. According to the old Latin version, as may be seen in Jacobson, St. Polycarp thus writes in the 13th chapter of his Epistle to the Philippians: "Scripsistis mihi et vos et Ignatius, ut si quis vadit ad Syriam, deferat literas meas, quas fecero ad vos .....*Epistolas sane Ignatii quæ transmissæ sunt vobis ab eo*, et alias, quantascumque apud nos habuimus, transmisimus vobis secundum quod mandastis; quæ sunt subjectæ huic epistolæ, ex quibus magnus vobis erit profectus: continent enim fidem, patientiam et omnem ædificationem ad Dnūm nostrum pertinentem." If this text be admitted it must at least be evident that a letter was written by St. Ignatius to the Philippians, which wholly subverts the theory of Cureton; and we must remark that this reading is most ancient, and was that found by Photius, who, in his Bibliotheca, (codice cxxvi.) commemorating the letter of S. Polycarp to the Philippians, writes: Λέγει και τας ἐπιστολας ἄυτοις Ἰγνατιου του θεοφορου ἀπεσταλκεναι, και ἀιτειται ἀναδιδαχθηναι παρ' ἄυτων ἔι τι περι ἔκεινου διακουσαιεν. The other reading which agrees with this passage, as cited by Eusebius, and varies only in one word from the Latin text, presenting, forsooth, ἥμιν instead of ὕμιν, implies, as Cotelerius well remarked, that two letters had been sent to St. Polycarp, one personal and the other addressed to the faithful of his See, and hence demonstrates that the letters of our Saint must not be limited to those of the Syriac text. It is unnecessary, too, to add that the phrases αλλας, οσας ειχομεν *alias quantascumque epistolas* can with difficulty be limited to two brief letters, as they must necessarily be if the hypothesis of Mr. Cureton be correct.

After such clear testimonies from the early Church it must be needless to refer to later writers, Socrates, John of Antioch, Andrew of Crete, St. John Damascene, Gelasius, Evagrius, and others, who refer not only to the letters

of the Nitrian MSS., but also to the additional four of the Medicean text. There are, however, a few witnesses to whose testimony, perhaps, a special interest may be attached. Thus, in the last work of the immortal explorer of patristic literature, Cardinal Mai, (Nov. Bib. Patt. tom. vi. part 2. page 328.) we find S. Theodore the 'Studite,' citing words of our Saint from the 7th chapter to the Ephesians, which is wholly omitted in the Syriac text. In "the Book" of Timothy of Alexandria, directed against the Council of Chalcedon, as we learn from the fragments of its Syriac translation in the Appendix to the "Corpus Ignat.," we meet a long passage from the epistles of our Saint to the Smyrneans, as well as many others from the Epistle to the Romans, which include parts omitted in the Nitrian version. Other extracts from the letters to the Magnesians and Trallians and Smyrneans, together with a passage from the Epistle to the Romans, are met with in the Syriac translation of "The Book of my Lord, the holy Severus, Patriarch of Antioch, against the wicked Grammaticus," as we learn from the same Appendix (p. 213, et seqq.). Cureton refers his patriarchal succession to the year 513. Thus we have here three letters cited which are not found in Cureton's text; and further, we have a passage from the letter to the Romans, which is omitted in the Nitrian version, and which, nevertheless, does not seem to have been arbitrarily referred to that Epistle, as may be seen from the manner in which it is presented. "Of Ignatius, Bishop of Antioch and martyr, from the Epistle to the Romans. Permit ye me to be an imitator of the suffering of my God. *But it is found in other copies which are older than these,* thus: Permit ye me to be a disciple of the suffering of my God."* Other passages are likewise cited from these Epistles in the Syriac, Epithronian Sermons of the same Severus; and another Syriac volume, mentioned by Cureton, entitled 'Book of the proofs of the Fathers, etc.,' as well as two other Syriac MSS. present the passage just mentioned from the letter to the Romans.

Many *intrinsic* arguments add too their weight to the

* Hence at least we may learn that manuscripts deemed ancient, even in the time of Severus, presented not the Syriac reading, but that of the Medicean text.

extrinsic evidence, and equally establish the Nitrian version to be but a fragmentary edition of the Ignatian epistles. Indeed, this hypothesis alone can explain the absence in the Syriac letters of individual and local references, and of the concluding or farewell formulas. Such abrupt terminations may indeed be well in conformity with the partial design of one who selects passages for his own special ascetic use, but is wholly repugnant to the epistolatory custom of the ancients, which was ever maintained in the early Church, and especially in the East, confirmed as it had been by the example of the Apostles themselves.

The continual recurrence, too, in the parts omitted in the Nitrian text, of the peculiar style and of the characteristic expressions of our Saint, seem to reflect on each succeeding sentence the image of the writer, whilst all being animated with the same sacred fire, and breathing alike the same heroic spirit, reveal at once as the common author of all, the glorious Martyr of Antioch. It would be tedious to dwell here in detailing these peculiarities of expression, but whosoever chooses to pursue this important argument will find abundant materials presented by the learned editor, Dr. Hefele, in his notes to the Ignatian letters.

Some formulas too seem to mark the date of the passages omitted in the Syriac text, and bear us back to the beginning of the second century, thus fixing for their origin the precise age of Ignatius. To take one instance; in the thirteenth chapter to the Magnesians we find in the solemn invocation of the divine persons, the Son mentioned before the Father, ἐν υἱῳ, και πατρι, και πνεύματι whilst, as we learn from Origen and St. Cyril, and other early Fathers, a fixed order in the invocation of the holy Persons, "Father, Son, and Holy Ghost," existed in the Church from the second century.

Even the very passages yet retained in the Syriac text reveal their true origin, and prove them to be mere extracts from the complete letters. Thus, for instance, they often retain conjunctive particles which however unite them not with what precedes in their Syriac form, but with the Greek text which is omitted; an opposition too is sometimes supposed in the members of a sentence, and yet no corresponding ideas are met with in the preceding Syriac words, but only in the omitted Greek passage. A few

examples from one of the epistles will illustrate this argument.

With the first chapter of the letter to the Ephesians we find united in the Nitrian letters a passage of the third chapter which begins, "*But* as charity does not allow me to be silent in your regard," ἀλλ ἐπει ἡ ἀγαπη, &c. The adversative particle, which is retained in the Syriac, can here have little connection with the concluding words of the first chapter, which contain the praises of Onesimus, Bishop of Ephesus, but is intimately connected with what immediately precedes in the Greek text: "I should be confirmed by you in faith and patience. But," &c., where the opposition becomes manifest, and the whole sentence is seen to be coherent in all its parts.

In the ninth chapter the Syriac text breaks in abruptly with the words ἡτοιμασμένοι εἰς οἰκοδομην θεου πατρος "prepared for the building of God the Father," whilst the Greek text presents the metaphor unbroken, and gives the true key to the whole passage, namely, that they rejected heresy, and allowed not the false teachers to scatter their perverse doctrines, ὥς ὄντες λιθοι θεου πατρος ἡτοιμασμενοι εις οἰκοδομην θεου.

Thus, too, in the Syriac letters, with the words from the tenth chapter, "Be ye imitators of our Lord, who is there that suffers more, who more destitute, who more despised?" is united a passage from the fourteenth chapter, which runs as follows, "Not that profession is the deed but that man be found in the strength of faith even to the end." It is quite clear that this passage has no connection with the words above, but it is found to fit in precisely, in the Greek text, "The tree is known by its fruits, so too those who profess themselves Christians (ἐπαγγελομένοι Χριστιάνοι,) are made known by their works. For now indeed it is not the profession (ἐπαγγελία) that is needed, but that each one be found in the strength of faith even to the end!"

Again, in the following chapter we find two sentences united which certainly would require a more than ordinary interpreter to determine what their meaning may be, or what precise relation they can bear to each other: Ἀμεινον ἐστιν σιωπαν και ἐιναι, ἡ λαλουντα μη ἐιναι-ἵνα δι' ὧν λαλει πρασση και δι' ὧν σιγᾳ γινωσκηται. In the Greek text, on the contrary, the meaning of the whole passage, as well as the connection of both members, becomes manifest. It is thus

translated by Hefele. "Melius est tacere et esse, quam loquentem non esse. Bonum est docere, si qui dicet, faciat. Unus igitur doctor qui dixit, et factum est. Sed et quæ silent fecit, digna sunt Patre. Qui verbum Jesu possidet, vere potest et silentium ipsius audire, ut perfectus sit, ut per ea quæ loquitur operetur, et per silentium suum cognoscatur."

There is one other passage to which we should wish to call attention. The nineteenth chapter of the same epistle begins with the words, "There was concealed from the Prince of this world the virginity of Mary, and her bringing-forth, and the death of our Lord: three wondrous mysteries which were performed in the silence of God. How then was he made known to man? A star shone in the heavens, surpassing all other stars in brilliancy, and its splendour was ineffable," &c. The Syriac text compendiates this passage thus: "There was concealed from the Prince of this world, the virginity of Mary, and the birth of our Lord, and the three mysteries of the shout which were performed in the silence of God by the star." The conclusion of this passage in the Syriac text is wholly devoid of sense, and proves this reading to be incomplete. But it is also manifest that the first words present in like manner its condemnation; as the three great mysteries *of the shout*, performed in the silence of God, that is concealed from Satan in the eternal councils of the Most High, but proclaimed to man by heaven itself, were surely the three just mentioned, viz., the virginity of Mary, and the birth of our Saviour, and His expiatory sacrifice on the cross. We must also remark that no other passage of our Saint's letters is more frequently cited by the ancient writers, Eusebius and others, than these words, and all invariably agree with the Medicean text.

There is another line of argument which is supplied to us by extant Syriac manuscripts, and which, though we have not seen it hitherto proposed against Mr. Cureton's theory, is of itself sufficient to demonstrate the fragmentary character of the published Syriac text.

The Nitrian MSS. from which Cureton derived his three letters of Ignatius, and which he designates for brevity sake by α, β, and γ, are not the only monuments which present to us Syriac remains of the Ignatian epistles. Hence the question at once suggests itself, do these other Syriac monuments present to us a distinct version from

α, β, γ, or do all alike belong to one common ancient Syriac version of the letters of Ignatius? Consistently with his theory, Mr. Cureton adopts the former opinion, but the evidence which the MSS. themselves afford compels us to embrace the latter; and hence, as these monuments present other *letters* than those of α, β, γ, and many fragments which are omitted even in the text of the three letters, we must conclude once more that the letters of Mr. Cureton's text are but three of the many written by our Saint, and present an incomplete or fragmentary edition even of these three letters.

We may now briefly examine whether the data supplied by some of these additional monuments be sufficient to determine the identity of their version with that of α, β, γ. In the first place we will refer to a manuscript of the Royal Library of Paris, which is numbered thirty-eight amongst the Syriac MSS., and before the Revolution belonged to the famous monastery of St. Germain de Pres; we may designate it by δ.

This manuscript contains a collection of canons from various councils, and many other works, and presents many extracts from the letters of Ignatius. These are edited by Mr. Cureton in the appendix to the "Corpus Ignatianum," pp. 197—201. In the fourth paragraph we find a passage from the sixth chapter of the Epistle to St. Polycarp, which is also contained in the Nitrian MSS. If, then, we compare this passage as it is found in δ and in γ, we will find that both manuscripts agree most perfectly in every particular.

Again, δ presents a portion of the third chapter of the same epistle, and if we compare this passage with the corresponding words of the Nitrian text we will find in like manner the same version in both. As to some slight variations which may be met with, it is unnecessary to remark that they nowise affect the identity of the version. For instance, in the passage just referred to δ presents the particle *den*, which is omitted in γ; but this particle, as the Greek δε or the Latin *autem*, is often found arbitrarily introduced or omitted by copyists through inadvertence, or for the sake of greater elegance. Indeed, in the present case the difference seems to arise from the omission of γ rather than the addition of δ, as that particle is required by the context, and its corresponding particle is retained in both the Greek and Latin versions. Another difference

between these texts in the passage last referred to, is in the word *chailthono*, which δ reads instead of the *ethlitho* of γ. But this change of one word cannot involve a difference of version, especially as both having the same meaning, and the word *ethlitho* occurring again almost immediately afterwards, the copyist might easily mistake the phrase and employ the same word in both instances.* This reasoning must be the more conclusive, as we find in the three manuscripts of Cureton, α, β, γ, similar and far greater variations very frequently recurring; thus, to take an example from the same epistle, p. 8, line 6, for *lebar*, β reads *belaad;* and in the following page, line 2, for *denecben*, β reads *acden*, adding moreover an additional word *gebrehen;* and only four lines afterwards reads *jejo den*, for the *ger* of α.

The ninth paragraph of δ presents another fragment coinciding in like manner with the last chapter of the same epistle, as found in γ, and their coincidence in this place is the more striking as the Syriac text is wholly different from the Greek received text. There is also another passage in δ (§ 1. n. 3) whose parallel may be found in γ in the Epistle to the Ephesians, chap. xv.

Thus to the very letter both texts agree in presenting this passage.

Now can it be conceived that such a similarity, we should rather have said, such a perfect identity, as exists between δ and γ in these various passages, could have had its origin in any other principle than in a common version from which both were derived? Were δ and γ distinct versions, or did they represent the text of distinct versions, it is impossible that with such a variety of Syriac words expressing the same idea, with such a diversity of construction, of phraseology, of form and order of words as the Syriac language allows, both translators should nevertheless have chosen precisely the same words, and adopted the same phraseology and construction, and thus presented independent texts, yet wholly similar and identical. This, too, should be the more remarkable as, according to Mr. Cureton's theory, δ must have been made some centuries

* We have not referred to the change of suffix *hun* into *kun*, as the whole syntax of the passage requires the former, and the error must be owing probably to the transcriber of the Parisian text.

later than γ; and no one is ignorant of the many changes every language presents even in the course of a few years, and in regard of the Syriac language these variations, as well in the use of words as in their form and grammatical construction, are easily recognized in its extant monuments.

But there is yet another reason which renders it still more evident that δ and γ present one common version of the letters of St. Ignatius. We have at hand independent or distinct versions of some portions of these letters. For instance, many passages from our Saint's letters occur in the Greek works of Severus of Antioch, and as these works were translated into Syriac by James of Edessa, in the sixth century, as we learn from Assemanni, (Bibl. Orientalis, tom. 1. p. 478,) these Syriac passages present a distinct version from that of α, β, γ. They are published by Cureton in his appendix, from a manuscript of the seventh century; and we must also bear in mind that the date of this version brings us back almost to the very time when according to Mr. Cureton δ's version must have been made. Now let us compare any of the quotations of Severus, in their Syriac form, with the corresponding text of γ. Shall we find an identity or similarity to subsist? Page 213 we find a quotation from the letter of St. Polycarp, which is also met with in γ; it will be found that no two words have the same syntax: the same word is scarcely ever employed to express the same idea, or presented in the same grammatical form.

A similar diversity is found in regard of the other extracts of Severus, p. 213, 215, and 216; and the same must be said of the other passages which are found in the translation of the works of Timothy of Alexandria, and other anonymus works, cited in the same appendix by Mr. Cureton. It will be especially evident in the translation of Eusebius, where the long passage from the Epistle to the Romans is introduced, and in which a distinct version is at once recognized by the use of different words, different syntax, different grammatical form and construction, and even by the different force given to the same words.

From what has been said it must clearly result that the manuscript of St. Germain des Prês presents to us the same ancient Syriac version as the Nitrian letters. As therefore we find in the former many passages, not only from the three letters of Mr. Cureton's text, but also from

the other letters of our Saint, and besides passages from the letters to St. Polycarp, the Ephesians, and the Romans, which are not found in the Nitrian text, we must necessarily conclude that α, β, and γ, do not present to us the entire ancient Syriac version, but only extracts from it.

Mr. Cureton anticipated, perhaps, this reasoning of ours when he made the assertion that the MS. of St. Germain de Pres is a mere translation of a collection of Greek works and canons. But, supposing it to be so, nothing would result against our conclusion; for it must ever remain true that, did the translator or collector present a new or independent version of the letters of Ignatius, the passages referred to could not retain their present identity with the ancient version. But it is, moreover, quite erroneous to suppose that the MS. of St. Germain was a translation from a Greek collection. It is sufficient to consult the description of the contents of the MS. supplied by M. Munk, and published by Cureton in his appendix, p. 342, seqq. From this we learn:

1. That it presents the Apostolic Canons and Constitutions, not according to the Greek method, but according to the peculiar form in which they were retained in the Syriac Church.

2. It contains many things which were never introduced into the Greek collections of Canons; for instance, § 3. 'the Book of Thaddeus;' § 87. 'Canons of Mar Rabula, Bp. of Edessa;' and the same must be said of at least eight of the other works and councils which are afterwards indicated.

3. In many cases the manner of numbering the Canons is contrary to the Greek usage, and in conformity with the peculiar system of the Syrians. Thus, the Greeks numbered twenty-five Canons of Ancyra; the Syrians only twenty-four. The former reckoned eight Canons of the Council of Constantinople, the latter only four; and a like difference existed in regard of the Ephesian Canons. (See Assemanni. Biblioth. Oriental, and the Collection of Ebedjesu, ap. Maj. Scriptt. Vett. Vaticana Collectio, p. 169, seqq.) Now the MS. of St. Germain adopts in all these cases the Syriac custom, as it also afterwards adopts it in describing the Canons of Chalcedon, of which the Syriac Church received only twenty-seven Canons, whilst the Greek Collections numbered at least thirty.

4. In every Greek collection we find some things bearing especial reference to the Church, for whose use it was compiled. Thus, in the collections for the Churches of Constantinople, of Ephesus, or of Alexandria, and, as we must remark, this custom dates earlier than the collection which we are now considering. All such particularities are wanting in the St. Germain MS.

5. But Mr. Cureton remarks that, in § 15 there is a note commemorating that the Council of Carthage was translated into Syriac in the year 687, whence he concludes not only as to the date of the collection, but also as to its being a mere translation from a prior-existing Greek collection. And yet the fact of this note being only added in reference to the 15th work, whilst it is omitted in the remaining forty-seven, can only be explained in one of two ways, either that *it* alone had been already translated, and was now inserted amongst the newly translated works; or that *it* alone had been now newly translated, whilst the other works were inserted from already extant Syriac versions. Now, the latter supposition is not only the more natural, but is also the only supposition consistent with the testimony of history. Amongst the other works introduced in this Collection, we find extracts from the letters of Severus; now, two versions were extant of the works of Severus, one, as we learn, from Assemani, being very ancient, and dating as early as the year 528, and the other being especially famous in the Syriac Church, having been made by their patriarch, Ebedjesu. (For the first, see Assemanni, Bib. Oriental, tom. 1. codd. Nitt. xxix. 569; xxxii. xxxiii. 570; and for the second, ibid. p. 478.) Thus, then, this note to the Council of Carthage, so far from substantiating the opinion of Mr. Cureton, seems rather to place in still clearer light the truth of our assertion about the works not thus marked by the Collector, and in particular about the letters of St. Ignatius, viz., that they do not present a newly-made version, but were only collected together from more ancient versions.

There are two other fragments of the Syriac letters of Ignatius mentioned in Mr. Cureton's Appendix, p. 296, and p. 291, which also supply sufficient data for determining them to belong to the same ancient Syriac version. In the passages which they retain in common with Cureton's received text, we find them employing the same phrases, the same syntax, the same number and order, as

well as the same grammatical form of words, which, as we have already remarked, it would be more than impossible to conceive, were they not extracted from one common, ancient version. We may add, that, besides Mr. Cureton's text, we have not only these two additional fragments, but also the version of Timothy, (p. 210-11.) and the version of Eusebius, p. 203, and also the version of Severus, p. 213, and again, the version of another anonymous work, p. 219, all presenting the same passages from the Epistle to the Romans; and should we place them all in parallel columns we would find that the two MSS. which we have referred to, agree with γ, for instance in words, in syntax, in construction, &c., whilst the other four texts which we know to present independent versions, differ in all these particulars, not only from γ and our two MSS., but also from one another.

Resuming, then, our argument, we have in addition to α, β, γ, three other monuments presenting extracts from the same ancient version of the Ignatian epistles; and as these three retain many portions of the letters not met with in Mr. Cureton's text, it follows that this cannot be considered to represent the ancient complete version of the letters of St. Ignatius.

The reasoning of Mr. Cureton is, at first sight, no doubt plausible, that his MSS. β and γ, must present the complete ancient version, since at the end of one we find the rubric "End of the three letters of Ignatius," and in the other we meet with a like rubric "End of Ignatius."

But we must remark that, as not only the same text is found in β and γ, but also very often the same omissions and the same errors of copyists, they must have been transcribed one from the other. So that the whole evidence to prove that the ancient Syriac version contained but three letters of St. Ignatius is reduced to the authority of one copyist, who, having finished his task adds, with joy, "end of his labour as to the letters of Ignatius." But, let us grant that Mr. Cureton has even the authority of two copyists, can their *rubric* justify his conclusion?

1. In the first place the conclusion at most could only be that in the opinion of those copyists, and as far as their acquaintance with the letters of Ignatius reached, these letters were only three in number. But it should not surprise us that in a distant monastery of Syria, some

copyist finding three letters of our Saint, would be ignorant of other letters having been written by him.

2. If the principle be once admitted that this testimony of the copyist must outweigh all historical evidence, we see no reason why Mr. Cureton should adopt more than one letter of St. Ignatius, as his MS. α presents only *one letter*, and yet in its rubric styles it "the letter of Ignatius," as we learn from the fac-simile of it presented in the 'Corpus Ignatianum.'

3. The testimony of the copyist of γ, is somewhat peculiar in its critical bearing, as after the three letters of Ignatius he adds two others of John the Monk, and at the end of all places his Rubric "end of Ignatius." It is somewhat strange that Mr. Cureton did not deem these two letters also to belong to the ancient Syriac version of St. Ignatius's letters.

4. But, before rushing at any conclusion from the Rubrics which we have mentioned, it would seem prudent to enquire what was the usage of the Syrian copyists, and what, according to their usage, were the ideas and conclusions involved in such rubrics. We may easily learn all this from the analysis of Syriac MSS., which is presented by Assemanni in his 'Biblioth. Orientalis,' and by Card. Mai, in his Vatican Collection of ancient writers. From these sources we learn that the Syrians delighted in *miscellaneous* collections; a sermon of one author, a treatise of another, nay more, we frequently find from the same treatise or discourse a portion in one manuscript, another portion in another. Indeed, to confirm this, it is not necessary to go further than the manuscripts of Mr. Cureton α, β, γ. The codex α presents in its first part its rubric 'end of Evagrius;' and yet it only presents one of his letters to Melania; in its second part it has some other works of Evagrius; and of all the books of the Old Testament, only the Prophecy of Isaias, and of all the letters of St. Basil, one only, namely, that addressed to St. Gregory Nazianzen. The same may be said of β; and in γ, the very title displays its miscellaneous character: "In the strength of our Lord Jesus Christ we begin to transcribe *a Collection from the holy Fathers.*" Then follow first in order a few letters of Evagrius, having at the end the rubric, "Here end the epistles of the Blessed Evagrius;" and afterwards are inserted one letter of St. Basil, a sermon of St. Cyril, which is nothing more than

the seventeenth book of his Treatise 'De Adoratione in Spiritu et Veritate,' (See S. Cyrilli Alexand. opp. 4 vols. fol. Paris, 1638, vol. i. p. 590.) and other works extracted in like manner from different Fathers. Thus, then, we see that it was the Syrian usage to introduce mere portions of the works of the Fathers, and nevertheless to add such rubrics as are found in connexion with the Ignatian letters.

5. We must not however be unfair towards the Syrian copyists; and if their rubric be properly understood, it will be manifest that it accords sufficiently well with the miscellaneous or fragmentary character of the works, and nowise involves the conclusion which Mr. Cureton would fain deduce from it. Indeed, any one that looks to the Syriac formula of the rubric will at once recognize that it only implies "end *of three* letters of Ignatius," or "end of letters of Evagrius," and not "end *of the three* letters of Ignatius," &c., as Mr. Cureton translates it: and in like manner the formula "end of Ignatius" is a mere transition formula, by which the copyist only implies, "so far I have transcribed from the writings of Ignatius, I now pass on to other works," and not "I have transcribed all the works of Ignatius."

But, asks Mr. Cureton, how account for the fact that these MSS. present only the same portions of the letters of Ignatius? The answer is not difficult; for, account as you may please for this fact, we have demonstrated to a certainty that they are all mere extracts from the ancient version of the Ignatian letters. We have however already hinted at the causes of this conformity in the MSS.; that in truth the extracts were made for individual ascetic use in some eastern monastery, and hence it should cause no wonder that many copies of this collection should have been made. Indeed, any one that remarks how carefully are omitted in these Nitrian manuscripts all historical particularities, all that refers to the controversies agitated in the Church when these collections were made, all that regards the mere individual interests of St. Ignatius, or of those to whom the letters were addressed, as well as the exhortations on the necessity of shunning the society of heretics, &c., must be convinced that such a compilation is precisely what would be adapted to nourish piety in those who lived retired from the world, and apart from polemical strife.

In 1849 the Armenian version of the letters of St. Igna-

tius was republished in Germany, by Petermann. The theory advanced by that distinguished Armenian scholar corroborates what we have advanced concerning the ancient Syriac version of these letters. He remarked that the Armenian version often deviates from the Greek text, and at every step seems to harmonize with the Syriac fragments; even when these are manifestly erroneous, the error is often retained in the Armenian version; the peculiarities of expression of the Syriac are faithfully copied, and when a peculiar force is given to the sentiment of our Saint, this is re-echoed in the Armenian text. He hence concludes that the Armenian version was not made from the Greek, but rather from the Syriac; and as it embraces not only the Cureton fragments, but also the complete letters of our Saint, it justly ensues that the Nitrian MSS. can present only a fragmentary text of the Ignatian epistles.

Before concluding this Article it may not be out of place to glance for an instant at the difficulties which are usually put forward against the genuineness of these letters of St. Ignatius. They are deduced from one or other of three sources,—the doctrines which are inculcated, the heresies which are combated, the language which is employed,—all which seem to refer the origin of these letters to a much later age than that of our glorious martyr. We shall make a few remarks on each of these heads.

1. Every principle of sound criticism requires that entering on the inquiry as to the genuineness of the letters which bear the name of Ignatius, we lay aside at the very threshold that prejudice which would identify our individual dogmatic views with those of the holy Bishop, and suppose that the peculiar sentiments which we cherish must in like manner have been entertained by him. Whosoever enters on a merely critical inquiry with such preconceived notions, may rest assured that he will falter at every step, and that his conclusions will ever remain uncertain and fallacious. For instance, what would the critic say were we to form to ourselves some peculiar notions of oratory or poetry, and then on a work being presented to us bearing the name of Tully or Homer, were we to test its genuineness by our pre-conceived notions, and declare it spurious, as disagreeing with what, in our opinion, a Homer or a Tully should have writtten? He

might indeed answer, that too much learning had rendered us insane, or surely he would reply that, as irresistible critical arguments prove the work to be a genuine production of him whose name it bears, it would be far better to lay aside our prejudice, and to harmonize our views in accordance with the true eloquence or poetry of these great masters.

Still, it must not so surprise us, that those who idolize their individual dogmatic views, should find some difficulty in acknowledging St. Ignatius to be the author of these epistles. For everywhere these letters present to us *the Church* as the living and divine exponent of truth; its Pastors are declared to hold the place of God over their spiritual flocks,—their teaching bears with it the seal of heaven itself, whilst they themselves, inheritors of the Redeemer's mission, perpetuate in a manner His presence with man. Instead, however, of rejecting the epistles of our Saint because they thus clearly lay down the Catholic teaching—the Catholic organization, so to say, of the Church of God, which condemns at once their errors, and brands them with the guilt of heresy, how much better would it be to remember that the clearest evidence establishes the genuineness of these letters, and hence seriously to reflect that it is a holy Bishop of the early Church, nay, a martyred disciple of the Apostles, that teaches such doctrine, and proposes it as the principle of faith, the guarantee against heresy, and the divinely constituted system of the Christian Church. And then, bowing down submissively to the Martyr's teaching, would they hasten to the Church of God, and instead of building to themselves broken cisterns, *there* drink in the waters of gladness from the fountains of the Saviour.

2. It is affirmed that the heresies which are combated in these letters were unknown in the commencement of the second century, and had their origin in a much later age. Yet, so far from the heresies and errors against which these letters are directed, being evidence of their later origin, they, on the contrary, supply new grounds for referring them to the age of Ignatius.

From many passages of the epistles of our Saint it is manifest that these heresies had but lately had their origin, and as yet had not acquired much strength. Some cities as Ephesus were as yet wholly free from the conta-

gion (ad Ephes. vi.); in other places only few τίνες, ὀλίγοι, ἄφρονες had been infected with it (ad Magnes. iv.; ad Smyr. v.; ad Trall. viii.). On the other hand the heretics were employing every means to disseminate their errors and scatter the cockle on the good seed, or as our Saint again expresses it, going about seeking whom they might devour (ad Ephes. ix.; ad Trall. viii.; ad Magnes. xi.; ad Smyr. iv.). Many writers, indeed, affirmed that two distinct heresies were combated by St. Ignatius in these letters, viz., the Docetae and the Judaizing Christians; but it has been well observed that the letters are directed only against one heresy, which, however, embraced in part the errors of both these sects. Did our Saint combat the Judaizers as a special heresy, he surely would have referred to the Circumcision, which, nevertheless, is nowhere alluded to; and, moreover, in the 8th, 9th, and 10th chapters to the Magnesians, we easily recognize the tenets of these heretics, whilst in the following chapter the same sect is supposed to be infected with the errors of the Docetae.

Now, such a heresy, embracing at the same time Docetism and Judaism, can only be referred to the beginning of the 2nd century. In the teaching of Cerinthus (an. 90.) they seem to have been partly thus combined; and in the year 130 we find both heresies completely distinct, and Basilides and Marcion, the heads of the Gnostics and Docetae, in open conflict with the Judaizers of that age. Hegesippus, too, (ap. Euseb. Hist. Eccl. iii. 32.) points to the first years of the second century as the time when the upholders of Judaism, hitherto spreading their tenets privately, (in occulto serpentes) at length laid aside the mask and raised the standard of revolt against the Church of God. Thus, then, the very heresy which is combated in these letters refers their origin to the commencement of the 2nd century, that is, to the precise date of the martyrdom of the glorious Bishop of Antioch.

3. In the 8th chapter to the Magnesians St Ignatius styles our Saviour the Eternal Word of the Father οὐκ ἀπὸ σιγῆς προελθων. Here the adversaries of the genuineness of these letters exultingly exclaim: behold the Σίγη of Valentinus! and hence unhesitatingly conclude that these letters can, at the earliest, be only coeval with this heresiarch, and thus have had their origin in an age subsequent to the martyrdom of Ignatius.

It should, however, be remarked, that the word σίγη is

one which, besides its characteristic and Valentinian reference, has also its trite and natural meaning. And hence, even should it be admitted that Valentinus was the first who attached to it its special and restricted heretical notion, our opponents could conclude nothing thence against the genuineness of these letters, unless they first established that, in our text, it is employed not in its natural and obvious sense, but in the restricted and characteristic reference of Valentinus. Now, receiving the whole passage in its plain and natural sense, its meaning is intelligible and manifest; that, in truth, Jesus Christ being the true *Eternal Word* (λογος) of God, is not like to the human λόγος which succeeds to silence, but having ever existed, and before all time, there was no *silence* (σιγη) to which he could succeed. Some writers, too, Victorinus, for instance, and Rupertus, record that Valentinus commenced the secret spread of his errors whilst the Apostle St. John was yet living. If this be admitted, then, well indeed might St. Ignatius have warned the faithful against his impious doctrines. But there is yet another important principle on which modern research has shed additional light, and which no longer admits of controversy; namely, that Valentinus derived his erroneous doctrines from preceding heretics, taking from the various heretical systems that which was adapted to his purpose, and then arranging all in one complicated whole. The ancient writers expressly commemorate this characteristic of the error of Valentinus. Theodoret, having spoken of the preceding heretics, adds, Ἐκ τουτων πασων των αἱρεσεων ὁ βαλεντινος λαβων ἀφορμας, τους ἀπεραντους ἄυτου συνεθηκε μυθους. (Hæretic. Tabul. i. 7.) Tertullian also writes: "Cujusdam *veteris opinionis semina* nactus, Colarbaso viam delineavit;" and earliest and most important of all, Irenæus, (adv. Hæres. i. 11.) ὁ μεν γαρ πρωτος ἀπο της λεγομένης γνωστικης αἱρεσεως, τας ἀρχαιας εἰς ιδιον χαρακτηρα διδασκαλιας μεθαρμοσας Ουαλεντινος. We find similar testimonies in St. Augustine, Epiphanius, and Philastrius. Some writers even go still further, and expressly commemorate the impious doctrine of Valentinus about the Σιγη as having been derived from the heretics of the first century, Simon and Cerinthus; thus, St. Gregory Nazianzen declares, in his 23rd Oration, and his testimony is corroborated by the "φιλοσοφουμένα" published at Oxford, in 1851, which excited for awhile such an intense interest in the literary

world. This important work presents a fragment from the Ἀποφασις μεγαλη of the archheresiarch, Simon, in which the *Sige* is introduced as the first *Eon* of his impious system; the passage is as follows: Λέγει γαρ Σιμων διαρρήδην περι τουτου ἐν τη Αποφασει ὄυτως· Ὑμιν ὂυν λεγω ἃ λεγω, και γραφω ἃ γραφω. Το γραμμα τουτο· δυο ἐισι παραφυαδες των ὅλων ἀιωνων μητε ἀρχην μητε περας ἐχουσαι, ἄπο μιας ριζης, ἥτις ἔστι δυναμις, σιγη, ἀορατος, ἀκαταληπτος ... ἥτις εστι μεγαλη δυναμις. Thus, then, if we hesitate to say that the σιγη is employed by St. Ignatius, in its plain and ordinary signification, we will find sufficient grounds in his coeval, and even in the yet earlier opponents of Christianity, to account for its more special and restricted reference.

In like manner the word λεοπάρδος which occurs in the 5th chapter to the Romans, was deemed by Basnage a clear indication of the recent origin of that epistle; and though this theory was long since refuted by Cotelerius and Pearson, yet we find it again repeated by Baur in later times. In the acts of the martyrdom of SS. Perpetua and Felicitas, written at the time of Severus, the word *leopardus* is more than once employed. Spartianus, too, presents a curious passage from a still more ancient writer, regarding the emperor Geta, in which this word is not only employed, but is, moreover, supposed to have been used by earlier writers: "Familiare illi fuit has quæstiones Grammaticis proponere, ut dicerent singula animalia quo modo vocem emitterent: velut agni balant, porcelli gruniunt, palumbes minurriunt, ursi sæviunt, leones rugiunt, *leopardi* rictant, elephanti barriunt, ranae coaxant, equi hinniunt, asini rudunt, tauri mugiunt: easque *de Veteribus* approbare." Verrius Flaccus, a writer of the Augustan age, employs it in like manner, as we learn from Festus; but it is more to our present purpose to remark that the Syriac version retains this entire passage, and employs too, the word *Nemero*, which precisely corresponds with the λεοπαρδος of the Greek text.

Again, St. Ignatius, in the 3rd chapter to the Smyrneans, cites these words as addressed by our Saviour to His disciples: Ἴδετε ὅτι ὀυκ ἐιμι δαιμονιον ἀσώματον. They are not taken from the Gospels, but seem to have been retained by many in the early Church, handed down by oral tradition; and we learn from St. Jerome and Origen that they were found in the apocryphal διδαχη Πετρου and in the Gospel of the Nazarenes. An ardent admirer of the theory

of Mr. Cureton, on the Ignatian letters, alluding to the words of Origen, thus writes: "The learned Father (Origen) stigmatizes the word ἀσώματος as one never used by an ancient ecclesiastical author. This proves clearly that the Epistle to the Smyrneans was fabricated after the time of Origen, and that materials not very orthodox or respectable were made use of in its compilation." (Edinburgh Review, July 1849, p. 166.) This writer, however, displays some prudence in not producing the text itself of Origen; it is as follows in Redepenning's edition of 'De Principiis,' p. 94, "Appellatio autem ἀσώματον, id est, incorporei, non solum apud *multos alios*, verum etiam apud nostras *scripturas* est inusitata et incognita. Si vero quis volet nobis proferre ex illo libello qui Petri Doctrina appellatur, ubi Salvator ad discipulos dicere videtur: Non sum dæmonium incorporeum: primo respondendum est ei, quoniam ille liber inter libros Ecclesiasticos non habetur; et ostendendum quia neque Petri est ipsa Scriptura, neque alterius cujusquam qui *spiritu Dei fuerit inspiratus.*" Thus, then, Origen merely affirms that this word is not used in the sacred Scripture, and in *many other writers;* and he declares that its being met with in the διδαχη Πετρου did not falsify his assertion, as that work did not belong to the *Ecclesiastical Canon*, nor was it written by one *divinely Inspired.* It is needless for us to add that, in like manner, its being used by St. Ignatius does not come in collision with the *real* assertion of Origen.

In conclusion, we may remark that hitherto the letter to St. Polycarp was deemed, of all others, the most liable to criticism; as whilst the other letters were all addressed to different Churches, in this case we had, in addition to a letter sent to the Church of Smyrna, a second letter directed to St. Polycarp, the Bishop of that See. The special friendship and mutual esteem of these two great saints was of course a sufficient reply to such a remark; and in addition to the many special arguments which, of old, established its genuineness, we have now precisely this letter put forward on account of the clear evidence of the Nitrian Manuscript and of the ancient Syriac version, as one of those letters which most incontrovertibly must be referred to the glorious Bishop of Antioch.

ART. VIII. *The History of England from the fall of Wolsey to the death of Elizabeth.* By J. A. Froude, M.A., late Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford. Vols. III. and IV. London: J. W. Parker and Son, West Strand, 1858.

THESE two volumes embrace the period in the History of England, which intervened between the death of Catherine and the death of Henry VIII. They are marked by all the picturesque power and that strange perversion of morality and truth which characterized the earlier volumes of this most monstrous history.* Most monstrous, for surely its publication is a moral anomaly, an outrage upon morality, a marvel, a mere prodigy of intellectual perversity; for its author is an apologist, nay, an enthusiastic eulogist of one of the greatest monsters of iniquity whom royal license and self-indulgence ever depraved. Throughout the work, with an audacity which seems almost as much to amuse as to astound, he persists in representing Henry, even in the very act of his life which has most consigned his memory to infamy, to have acted from the most upright motives, yea, even to have yielded reluctantly to the stern dictates of duty! It was not lust which led to the divorce from Catherine! oh no, it was a sense of sacred obligation. Not that it was the mere scruple of private conscience; no: the author either could not expect his readers to be capable of the credulity which would credit *that*, or he himself deemed it far more to redound to the honour of his hero, that he acted on considerations of practical expediency. It was from a large-minded concern for the welfare of the realm that Henry wedded Anne. It was from anxiety for an heir. True, Catherine, the queen, to whom he had been married twenty years, had given him a daughter—the virtuous Mary. But it was from desire for an *heir* that Henry was desirous of a divorce from Mary's mother. Throughout the work Mr. Froude strives to inculcate this. Thus, in the third volume, which opens with a *resumé* of Scottish history, from the marriage of Henry's sister Margaret to James IV., to the period of Henry's divorce, he thus

* See the two first vols. reviewed, No. lxxxii.

denounces Margaret's conduct in favouring the marriage of her son with Magdalen of Valois. "Had she played her part" (i. e. according to Henry's will) "the marriage would have been arranged between James and Mary," (Henry's daughter,) "an act of parliament would have declared them, should no male heir be born to the king, joint inheritors of the two crowns. Then there would have been no divorce from Catherine, for there would have been no object for a divorce. No miserable scandals would have clouded the declining years of Henry. Perhaps there would have been no breach with Rome, and no Reformation, in the form which it in fact assumed." A curious admission for an Anglican. But the fact is too notorious that the Reformation had its rise really from the desire of Henry for his marriage with Anne. It is, indeed, the very reason why his Anglican apologist is so anxious to free that marriage from the odium which belongs to it. In order to do so, he of course has striven hard to destroy the belief of Henry's previous intimacy with Anne's sister, if not her mother also. And in this volume he has a lengthened and elaborate argument (see the Appendix) to disprove it. But by a diverting fatality he has helped to establish it, and has done as much as could be done to prove its truth beyond a doubt; for he has shown that it was a charge stated by a holy man, entitled to credit, before the very face of the monarch himself, and that it was not by him denied. In narrating the examination of Sir G. Throckmorton on the subject, in 1537, he says: "His authority had been Peto, the Greenwich friar. Peto had told him that the king had meddled both with Lady Boleyn and with Mary. Peto had declared that in 1532, when he was questioned for the sermon which he had preached in Greenwich chapel, he had accused the king to his face of his incestuous connection, and Throgmorton believed Peto." Now this, on Mr. Froude's own admission, was Throgmorton's statement to the Council, when challenged as to the source of his information on the subject. A statement more obnoxious to the king, or more clearly tending to establish his guilt, after five years' silent acquiescence in the charge, one could scarcely conceive. Yet Throgmorton shrank not from making that statement in the face of the king's council, that a holy friar had declared that he had accused the king to his face of the foul incest imputed to

him. After this, when we think of the allusion in the Pope's letter to the king, (illicito coitu) on which Dr. Lingard relied, and the open accusation of Pole, it surely will require more than even the audacity of Mr. Froude to maintain the morality of that marriage and that divorce, but for which he himself admits the "Reformation" might not have taken place! Mr. Froude himself says: "It seemed strange to me that in the many replies to Pole's book, there should have been no allusion to so important a charge. Pole was accused in these replies of having said many things which were not true, and several new statements were examined and exposed in detail, but this particular one received no special mention, and here again the silence was mysterious." Most mysterious! still, our author thinks it is "explained." And how? By the discovery in the Rolls' House of *an* original MS. copy of the book, *apparently* (?) corrected in Pole's own hand, and in *all likelihood* the very one which was originally sent to the king (Froude, iv. appendix). When Mr. Froude wrote his appendix he had forgotten a certain note in his third volume, where, referring to this very document he thus describes it: "A MS. copy of the book, apparently the original which was sent by Pole, scored and underlined in various places, *perhaps by members of the Privy Council.*" (Froude, iii. p. 33. *in notes.*) He adds: "A comparison of the MS. with the printed version shows that the whole work was carefully re-written for publication, and that various columns in detail were not in the first copy." Well, but they were in the *printed copies of the work*, which is far more important, and of which, of course, Henry and his council would be cognizant. As to the MS. copy, it is left wholly uncertain by whom, or for whom, it was made, and *when.* It *may* have been the original copy sent by Pole; if so, that would account for its omitting anything calculated to render reconciliation impossible. It may have been a copy castrated by the king, or by his council. But it is absolutely immaterial and worthless; and it reflects little credit on Mr. Froude's historical acumen and candour that he should seem to suppose that it is worth anything at all, against the fact that the printed copies charged Henry with the enormous crime imputed. Passing by the very dubious representation as to Pole's handwriting, and the 'likelihood' that it was the copy originally sent

to the king, it is worth while to observe, on the "mysterious silence" as *to date*, and still more on the egregious assumption implied in this statement, that the king never saw or heard of any *other* copy of the book *containing* the charge, with which it is well known, all Europe had been shocked and disgusted. But Mr. Froude is satisfied with the complacent remark that, on examination of the MS. he found that in the original (*query what* 'original?') "the Mary Boleyn story is not mentioned at all;" and so, he says, "the difficulty from the silence of the council is thus disposed of." Is it? Why, to 'dispose' of it, it must be shown that this was the *only copy* ever seen, known, or heard of by the king and his council, that he had never had one before, (of which this possibly was a castrated copy,) or that he had never had or heard of one afterwards; a most monstrous assumption, which even Mr. Froude does not venture so much as to suggest; and he could indeed scarcely do so, seeing that he himself admits that the silence of the king and council on the subject of the charge was 'mysterious,' which of course implies that, as he indeed states, it was contained in copies of the book contemporaneously published, and which must have come to the knowledge of the king and his council.

No! "the offence is rank, and smells to heaven;" it is past the power of any subtlety or sophistry—it is established by the very apology. It may now be taken as an undoubted fact, that Henry had committed sin with the sister, if not the mother also, of Anne Boleyn, as it is not disputed that he had with herself, before his marriage with her. And all this must have been well known to the courtiers—aye, and the courtly prelates too, of Henry's court. It is impossible that it could have been concealed. The fact that he was publicly and openly accused of it by the heroic Peto, or the absent Pole, shows that it was notorious. Yet we find that, except the saintly friar, not a single man in the realm had the courage to express his disgust at it. Still less do we find that it led Cranmer, or any of his brother prelates, to remonstrate against the marriage with Anne, or that it operated in parliament to obstruct for an instant the passing of the bill of attainder against her, although, at the very same time her marriage was declared both by prelates and by peers, to have been void. It is this slavish servility which loads the episcopate and the parliament of that time with all the depravity of the

king, and affects the Reformation with its indelible taint of infamy. For the prelates and the parliament, who submitted to the royal supremacy, are they who shared this servile acquiescence in every depraved desire of a tyrant's will. Mr. Froude is well aware of this; he in fact owns it on several occasions, we recollect, in his former volumes. We recal a remark of his to the effect that the supposition that Anne Boleyn was innocent would cover with infamy the parliament which disavowed the Papal Supremacy, and who voted her attainder, not observing the fact, that while attainting her for adultery, they affirmed her marriage void, thus covered themselves with the very infamy he deprecates. But that he should so earnestly deprecate it shows his consciousness that it is morally fatal to the Reformation, that its origin should be traced to a servile submission to royal depravity. This it is which makes him so strenuous in defending the character of Henry. Mr. Froude is too keen to adopt the shallow subterfuge which seeks to evade it by some silly fallacy about his having been the instrument of Providence. He sees clearly that he was the author of the work,—that he it was, who, for right or wrong, threw off the "bonds" of Rome, though really to impose his own. And in short he labours to make him the main figure in the scene, as undoubtedly he was, and all the others, parliament or prelates, were his subservient tools. This makes it necessary, in order to defend the Reformation, to defend the objects for which he separated the realm from Rome. And this our author does, without flinching or shrinking, and with the most unscrupulous sacrifice of morality or truth. It argues strange ideas of morality on the part of our apologist, that he should seem to deem it not an offence requiring apology for his hero, that he had lived in illicit intercourse with *Anne*. It is only the idea of the double offence which appears to excite his apologetical powers. But does not the *admitted* offence prove Henry to have been a man of unbridled lust, and make the double offence *a priori* not unpardonable? And does it not, at all events, quite destroy the notion our author affects to entertain, that Henry's marriage with Anne was a mere matter of state policy? Does Mr. Froude think that his readers are ignorant of the previous *liaison* with her, and its *visible* result, and the *obvious* pressing reason for the hasty celebration of the marriage?

And is all this reconcilable with the fine theory about anxiety for the welfare of the realm? Really it is one of the worst symptoms of the age, this tendency to tamper with first principles for the sake of a purpose; to sophisticate plain facts into paradoxical absurdity, to outrage truth and trample upon morality, in order to uphold an argument and maintain a cause. We have read a good deal that is insulting and offensive about Popish morality, about the 'teaching' of St. Alphonsus or of Maynooth, and the sophistry of the 'Jesuits.' But if men wish to see the lengths to which false morality and sophistry may pervert men's intellect, they must read the work of Mr. Froude.

The plain English people of that age judged Henry differently. The whole of the North was at one time in arms against him, from the Trent to the Tweed, the South being kept down by force. Nothing can be clearer, from his own account, (which is one of the best portions of his third volume,) that the nation was against this monster of a monarch. Mr. Froude, with all his art, cannot conceal the fact that they were coerced by military force. More than that, he shows what a hateful system of *espionage* had been introduced, and how thoroughly the spirit of despotism was paralysing the social system of England, and producing at once a sense of terror, and resulting in a slavish subserviency to tyranny. He gives "specimens from time to time of the 'informations,' of which the Record office contains so many." "They serve," he says, "to keep the temper of the country before the mind." Aye, but they serve for more than that, they show the degrading thraldom under which the country was enslaved, and the system of espionage which despotism had spread over it, and which must have made each man fear his neighbour was a spy. Let us see.

"A farmer of Walden was accused of having wished that the king had broken his neck." "An old woman was heard muttering that there would be no good world until it fell together by the ears, for with clubs and clouted shoon should the deed be done." "Sir Thomas Arundel wrote up that a very aged man had been brought before him, who had said that the forests should rise against the king and make a field." "A groom was dressing his master's horse, when the ostler came in and said there no Pope, but a Bishop of Rome. And the groom said

he knew there was a Pope; and the ostler, and they who held his part, were strong heretics, and the ostler answered, that the king's grace held of his opinion; and the groom said, that he was one heretic, and the king was another, and said, moreover, that this business had never been, if the king had not married Anne Boleyn." The ostler was right, and the ostler spoke the general feeling of the nation, and he spoke notorious and palpable truth, which all Mr. Froude's sophistry cannot disguise. He is quite right in saying that these things show "the temper of the country." But they show the tyranny which was oppressing it. What a system of despotism must that have been under which the "mutterings" of old women, and the murmurings of grooms, ostlers, and others of the humblest classes were betrayed to the king's counsel!

It is clear that it could no longer have been "merry England." Each man must have been afraid of his neighbour. Men and women must have shrunk from speaking their thoughts. A horrible thraldom must have weighed upon the very minds and souls of the English people. The slightest whisper of discontent was considered as "sedition." And sedition was construed as treason. Nay, a statute passed making it a capital offence for the hearer of aught seditious not to denounce the speaker! The tyrant, conscious that the nation was disgusted with his impious assumption of supremacy, and yearned for the lost allegiance to Rome, set on foot by means of his minions a detestable system of espionage, which made it almost as perilous to hear, as to utter, a word against his measures, which paralysed the voices of all but the few brave enough to die, making every man certain to feel that a whisper might betray him to death, and hushing the tongues of all into a terror-stricken silence, or moving them to a servile tone of adulation. The result we see in the fulsome effusions of flattery in which the tyrant's ministers wrote to each other, or to him, and which Mr. Froude is not ashamed to parade before his readers as historical authority! And there is something at once ludicrous and atrocious in quoting these secret *exparte* hearsay stories as trustworthy testimony. Not only are they not reliable testimony, but they are utterly inadmissible, on all and every principle of credibility. They have every vicious incident or quality which excludes evidence as wholly unworthy of reliance, because destitute of any

reasonable credibility. The probability *a priori* is, that they are *not* true, not to be depended upon. They are secret, *exparte*, interested, and certain to be biassed, coloured, distorted, rather than to contain simple truth.

Now this it is of the utmost importance to bear in mind when reading works such as this of Mr. Froude's. It is in some degree a common characteristic of Protestant writers to have recourse to such unreliable testimony; though in no instance has there been such an unscrupulous and unlimited resort to it. There is an illustration of it in the account given of the pious and charitable efforts of Paul III. to effect a reconciliation with Henry. First Henry is represented as taking a high and lofty tone towards the Pope, and Mr. Froude cites, not only without any expression of disgust, but with apparent sympathy and approval, the tyrant's hypocritical and insolent pretences. "He had laid his foundations upon the laws of God, nature, and honesty," &c., (Froude, iii. p. 12,) "and with consent of the states of the realm in Parliament;" which "states of the realm" were at that very time (1536) about to surrender to him the smaller monasteries. Then Mr. Froude, having taken pains to represent a rapacious tyrant as a hero, goes on to depict the Pope as a mere diplomatist, seeking to entrap Henry by ingenious baits and artful devices, and ready to send a nuncio to grant everything which the king could reasonably demand. "Limiting like a man of business the advantages which he had to offer to the present world, the Pope suggested that Henry, in connection with himself, might now become the arbiter of Europe. He lauded the king's early character, his magnanimity, his generous assistance in times past to the Holy See, his devotion to the Catholic faith. Forgetting the 'Holy League,' glossing over the Bull of Deposition, as an official form which there had been no thought of enforcing, he ventured to say that for himself he had been Henry's friend from the beginning. He had urged his predecessor to permit the divorce, had sent a red hat to the Bishop of Rochester, (Fisher,) only that he might have the benefit of his assistance at the approaching council; and when he heard of his death, he had but seemed for a time to consent to measures which would never have been executed." Now the whole of this purports to be founded on the Letter of Sir Gregory Cassalis to Henry. And down to the passage bracketted, it is fairly translated

from passages which are actually cited by Mr. Froude therefrom. The valuelessness of such secret statements by Henry's own envoy *to Henry*, we have already remarked, and it must be obvious that the proper and authentic testimony of the Papal views would be a Papal letter to Henry, not the *exparte* and secret reports of Henry's envoy.

But if the one-sided statements of Henry's envoy are worthless, what can be the value of his advocate's *version* of those statements? The passage we have printed in brackets is Mr. Froude's gloss upon Cassalis, and he does not venture to cite any specific sentences from the envoy's letter to support it. This variation is remarkable since for the previous passages citations are given, and it is in these latter passages that all the *venom* of the insinuations levelled at the Pontiff is mainly embodied. For these malignant insinuations Mr. Froude cannot even trust the envoy of the tyrant, but he "distils the venom" of his calumny himself, and gives merely a general reference to the letter of the envoy, without even enabling the reader to see how far he has quoted his questionable authority fairly. Is this the way to write history?

A keen observer could detect internal evidence of falsity in the statement coined by our author from the Letter of Cassalis. It makes the Pontiff link together in his apologetical appeal, his conduct as prelate and as Pope. "He had urged his predecessor to permit the divorce; he had sent a red hat to the Bishop of Rochester," &c. The former act, (assuming the statement of Cassalis to be true,) was before the Pontiff's election to the Popedom, the other was an official act as Pope. There is a pretty strong improbability that a Pontiff, if he spoke apologetically of the latter at all, would link it with the former. Even a Protestant author is aware of the tremendous difference between the official acts of the Pontiff and acts not those of the Pope. Mr. Froude himself observes, "It was true that, as Cardinal of Ravenna, Paul III. had been an advocate for Henry," (i.e., as our author ought to have explained, his advocate at the Papal court, just as a man may have an advocate at any court,) "and his abrupt change on his election to the See proves remarkably how the genius of the Papacy could control the inclination of the individual." In a certain sense this is true, and no doubt the sacred, the awful character of Christ's Vicar,

brings along with it sanctions and illuminations alike, and in an ineffable and inalienable way, derived from heaven. But there is no peculiar significance in the simple fact that the spirit of the advocate should not pervert the august functions of the Supreme Judge.

Now pass again from Mr. Froude speaking of the Pontiff to Mr. Froude speaking of the king he makes his hero. "On receiving the list of grievances, the king, then three weeks married to Jane Seymour, in the first enjoyment, as some historians require us to believe, of a guilty pleasure, purchased by an infamous murder;" "as some historians require us to believe;" which implies that Mr. Froude does not. But was it not so? On his own showing was it not so? Did not his hero's chosen prelate, Cranmer, pronounce the marriage with Anne Boleyn to have been void, (as void it undoubtedly was, the first wife, Catherine, living,) and did not Henry execute her for adultery? And was not that murder? aye, murder most foul, and most horrible? And was it not *true* then that "the king, then *three weeks* married to Jane Seymour," (soon to perish in her turn,) "in the first enjoyment of a guilty pleasure, purchased by an infamous murder, drew up with his own hand a body of articles * * * the first authoritative statement of doctrine in the Anglican Church." (Froude, iii. 67.)

And then Mr. Froude, having done his utmost to veil or disguise the simple awful truth, and having by his tone betrayed not disgust, but secret admiration for this most horrible display of hypocrisy and blasphemy by the lustful and the sanguinary tyrant, proceeds to quote these "Articles," as if they were "texts cull'd from Holy Writ," instead of the arbitrary dictates of a brutal despot! And then he quotes with still more ardent sympathy the coarse *diatribes* of Latimer against the Pope and the Papal clergy, which just as little as those of Luther deserved admiration even for boldness, marked as they were not by courage, but by cunning, contrived to suit the purpose and the taste of the tyrant of the time, to pander to his vile passions, and excite the feelings of the populace against the objects of his hate. Is this the Anglican notion of heroism? Pandering to the passions of a tyrant!

There are passages in Mr. Froude's book which afford a better idea of heroism. Thus when he has been narrating the Catholic insurrection in the north, and the execu-

tions by which it was avenged, he says:—"So we take leave of Robert Aske, closing his best greatness with a felon's death. Yet as we look back now at a distance of three centuries, when the noble and the brave, the conquerors and the conquered, have been all long dead together, and the short years which might have been his, had he, like so many others, denied his faith, and truckled to the time, (like Cuthbert Tunstall, for instance, who when upbraided for denying his belief in the Pope, said he had never thought to lose one drop of blood for it,) have dwindled down to a point, when nothing remains of any one but his work, a man who risked and lost his life for a cause which he believed just, is not among those whose fate deserves the most compassion, or whose career is least to be envied." Most true. But here Mr. Froude falls into a strange mistake, and all the stranger as that it can be corrected out of his own statements, and in his own words. He says, that "if the Catholic insurrection had succeeded, its beacons would have been blazing martyr piles, shining dreadfully through all after ages, and their names would have come down to posterity swathed in such epithets as cling, and will cling for ever, to the Gardiners and the Alvas." By which it is plain that our author implies that the spirit of persecution is identified with fidelity to the Papacy. This is a fallacy pervading most Protestant writers, but there never was a more flagrant one, and we are happy to find any occasion to refute it. It is the very reverse of the truth. In all ages, and in all times, since the Christian Church was first established, it has been those who were most unfaithful to the Papacy who have been most prone to persecution. Not to go now further back than this very reign of Henry (except just to mention that the law against the Lollards was passed by an anti-papal parliament which refused to listen to the repeal of the statutes levelled against the Holy See) can any one forget that the sword of persecution was unsheathed by the sovereign who had disclaimed the Papal Supremacy, and against those who defended it? And did not Cranmer lend himself to the bloody cruelty of the "Six Articles," under which Catholics and Protestants were burnt together by the order of the same fell tyrant? Did not the "martyr" Latimer *preach* at the burning of the friar Forest? Add also the Prelates who were most eager in consigning heretics to the flames, were

they not the very men who were most ready to deny the Papal Supremacy? Our author himself, in the very passage we have cited, alludes to the courtly servility of Cuthbert Tunstall. He mentions Alva and Gardiner, and elsewhere Bonner. Did not Bonner and Gardiner concur in the disclaimer of the Papal authority; and were they not both the servants, the one as the minister, the other as the emissary, of the tyrant Henry? And as for Alva and his master Philip, and his future consort Mary, why was not that the very Alva whose troops menaced the Holy Father with a repetition of the sack of Rome; and was not that the very Philip of whom the Pope exclaimed bitterly when some one spoke of him as his friend, "my friend! the man who sought to crush me!" Was not the dark despotic spirit of Philip as inimical to the spiritual liberty of the Holy See as it was to the political liberty of his subjects? And did he not infuse that spirit into our English Mary, and help to mislead her into those cruelties which have attached a stigma to her name? And was not she imbued with the same spirit as her father (albeit she did not carry it to quite the same extent); did she not refuse to receive the Papal Legate sent to supersede her cousin Pole; did she not imitate the insolence of her royal predecessors, Tudor or Plantagenet, and refuse to receive or recognize Papal briefs which happened to run counter to her will? When will Protestants learn to distinguish between the Prelacy and the Papacy, and to bear in mind that the Church is responsible for nothing which is not sanctioned by her head, and certainly is not to be condemned for the deeds of those of her children who are unfaithful to the primal law of her existence, obedience to Christ's Vicar upon earth. Mr. Froude falls into the same fallacy in regard to Scotland, when he seeks to cast upon the Church the odium of the burning of Hamilton or of Wishart. It is as absurd as unjust to attempt to identify the Church with the cruelty of Beton or the bigotry of Bonner. It is as absurd as it would be to identify her with their alleged immoralities. These men, it is said, were worldly, and pursuing their own purposes, interest, and policy. Be it so. Then they were unfaithful to the Church and to her Head; and the Church is responsible for the acts of none who are unfaithful to her Head, and to her law. Mr. Froude makes out a powerful case, without intending it, for the Papacy.

He says, the Bishops (he is speaking of 1537) after they had concurred in disclaiming the Royal Supremacy, were all at sea. They could not agree even as to the number of the sacraments: "The Archbishop of York insisted on the apostolical succession, the Archbishop of Canterbury believed that priests and bishops might be nominated by the Crown, and he that was so appointed needed no consecration." He omits to observe that "the Archbishop of Canterbury" was the king's creature, Cranmer. So was Gardiner. So was Bonner. Mr. Froude himself mentions how Bonner was selected by Henry on account of his zeal in his service, for a mission abroad, and how Gardiner was equally zealous at home. It is clear that theological unity had vanished with the Papal supremacy. How could it be otherwise? It is the argument of necessity; and so far as the Papacy, which is divine in its origin, can depend upon any argument at all—that is the great argument for its authority. And our author abundantly upholds it. He shows that when it had been disclaimed all unity disappeared, even among the episcopate; and for the people at large he depicts very powerfully the sad result. On both sides the same obstinate English nature was stirred into energetic hate. He describes with painful vividness the social bitterness, the daily strife, the retaliations of cruelty.

"So went the world in England, rushing forwards, rocking and reeling in its course! What hand could guide it? Alone perhaps of living men the king still believed that unity was possible, that those headstrong spirits were as horses broken loose, which could be caught again and harnessed for the road. For a thousand years there had been one faith in western Christendom. From the isles of Arran to the Danube thirty generations had followed each other to the grave, who had all held the same convictions, who had prayed all in the same words. What was this that had gone out among men, that they were so changed?" (Froude, iii. 242.)

And then he quotes the address of the king, who "alone of living men believed that unity was possible," and that the means to it was his own arbitrary will; and who told the people, "We will have no more contentions, we will that all preachers agree;" as if the word of a tyrant, powerless to arrest the ebb and flow of the sea, could stay the swelling tide of human opinion, when once the embankments of faith and divine authority had been removed!

As if after having ceased to believe in Popes they would believe in kings! Strange folly in kings and prelates to fancy it. Cranmer in the sixteenth century had shaken the faith of England in the Papacy, and Gardiner and Bonner, and all the rest of them, had helped him to do it; and now they fancied, forsooth, that royal power could uphold the faith, and leaned upon a tyrant's arm, and sought to live in a tyrant's breath! Vain hope! So in the next century, Bossuet, with his Gallicanism, shook the faith of France in the divine authority of the Papacy, and fancied that the faith would survive! The next century after that showed that men who had ceased to believe in the Pope would soon cease to believe in the Church. Bossuet's unconscious work was completed by Voltaire, and he was the precursor of Robespierre. First went the Papal authority, then the Church, then Christianity. Such was now the downward course into which England was falling in the middle of the sixteenth century, and by just the same means was she conducted to it. Bonner, and Cranmer, and Gardiner, (strange fellow-labourers in the same fatal work, yet so they were,) helped to teach men to worship the king, and listened alike with slavish reverence while he put forth his "definitions" of doctrine or discipline. Was it not enough to destroy men's belief in Christianity to see such prostitution of the episcopate to tyranny! The bishops themselves were conscious of their degradation. Gardiner, writing to a bishop, uses these curious words: "Sorry am I, for the credit of our order, that you should have so acted at a time when, if there be a knavish action performed anywhere a bishop is ever suspected of having played the chief hand in it."* No doubt it was so, for had not the episcopate lost the confidence of the people, and been themselves faithless to Rome, the sad schism could not have taken place. But how came it that they were such manner of men? Here is the whole moral of the phase of history, and Protestant writers, aye, and Catholic writers also, often miss it. Our author, however, himself, in a former volume, has given it unintentionally in a single sentence. "The power of the Pope over the

* "Si quid astute aut callide fiat in eo primum ad episcopos deferunt."—Gardiner to the Bishop of Arras. State Papers, vol. x. p. 193.

episcopate had been for centuries a *sham*." The statutes of provisors in England, and "Pragmatic Sanctions" in Germany and France, had secured to the sovereigns the nominations to the episcopate. The result was what we have seen; the prelacy was courtly, servile to tyranny; the clergy became unfaithful, and the people lost confidence in the Church. No doubt there were exceptions; no doubt there were saints in every age; no doubt the foul stories of clerical vice are mere vulgar slanders; no doubt the Church contained within herself an undying principle of vitality; but then its development depended upon unity, and the general defection of the episcopate from the centre of unity had so weakened and rent the Church, that she was powerless to grapple with the world, and everywhere fell under the yoke of tyranny. "The boar out of the wood did waste her, the wild beast of the forest devoured her."

But worst and fellest foes of all were the "wolves in sheep's clothing," ever ready to rend and tear the chief shepherd of the flock; the "hireling" pastors too often willing, at the desire of their royal masters, to betray him. In no way did they more grievously betray him, in no way were they more servile to the royal will, in no way did they greater mischief to the Church, than when at his behest they kindled the fires of persecution. For it was ever at the tyrant's bidding that they did so. One of the most monstrous of the fallacies which Mr. Froude desires to impose upon his readers is the notion that Henry was moderate, and averse to persecution! His disposition, according to our author, was as alien from cruelty as from adultery. And thus after narrating how the "Bloody Six Articles" were passed, he tells us that its cruel character was owing to the bishops, especially to Gardiner, and that it was not in its extreme form the work of the king, nor did it express his own desires." As if its being the work of the courtly prelates, whom he himself had appointed, and who in turn had impiously made him their "head," made it any the less his work! As if they or any other of their time had dared to pass laws against his will! least of all upon the subject of religion after he had assumed the supremacy! But the fact is that the Articles were drawn by the king's own hand, and were an emanation of his own despotic and tyrannical will. Mr. Froude knowing this, seeks to get rid of the fact by representing that the Arti-

cles were not in "their extreme form" the work of the king; but the only particular he adduces in which one act passed varied from the Articles as drawn, is a comparatively insignificant provision about a prisoner's having a copy of the depositions, &c. The great matter of course was that the offences against the Articles were made capital, and Mr. Froude does not, and could not venture to affirm that they were not so drawn by the king. And he forgets when he tried to represent that the king did not assent to them in their ultimate form, that they were enacted into a statute with the assent of king, lords, and commons. But then he tells us that the king did not altogether relish the operation of the act. "There was not a man of note who had spoken a word against Rome but was under suspicion or arrest." This was in 1539, after the king had denied the supremacy. No wonder that he did not like men to be impeached for fidelity to Rome. The Six Articles, be it observed, related not to the supremacy; of course the tyrant was not likely to let *that* be made the test of orthodoxy. But most of those who imitated the king in denying the supremacy were not long in lapsing into other heresies within the Articles, and on the other hand, all who fell within their scope were with him on the cardinal point of the supremacy. He found, in a word, that none but heretics, or those inclined to heresy, were among his adherents, and that all heretics were so. The clergy and the prelacy had been *coerced* into a denial of the supremacy, and Mr. Froude himself says they were suffering remorse of conscience for their perjury in abjuring the Pope, whom they still reverenced, "and to whose feet they longed to return." The king well knew this, at least he soon found it to be so, when he saw that *none* could be impeached under his "Bloody" Act except those who, like himself, hated the Holy See. Hence he became unwilling that its bloody provisions should be enforced. He saw clearly that it would operate against his own adherents, not against the Pope's. Mr. Froude wants us to believe that it was from clemency, charity, and love of moderation, that the tyrant shrank from the execution of the Act! Hence it was, he says, that "by a summary declaration of pardon the bishop's dungeon doors were opened, and the prisoners were dismissed." Here is a choice specimen of historical candour. "The bishop's dungeon door." The bishops being the nomi-

nees of the king, and the Act which filled the dungeons having been drawn by his own hand!

No doubt the bishops could not complain that the prison doors were opened and the prisoners dismissed. For what a monstrous thought it was to burn men for denying a dogma, at the same time teaching them that there was no divine Authority on earth to define it! That men should be bound to take their faith from kings, who were taught to scoff at popes! The foundation of all faith was destroyed. There was nothing left for it but tame submission to tyranny. And a tyrant's will was arbitrary, and governed by mere expediency. Henry stopped the persecutions, not from clemency, but from policy. He would gain nothing by upholding the dogmas of the Church. He could lose only by weakening those who had helped him to cast off the Supremacy. It is an insult to our sense for Mr. Froude to talk of Henry's clemency. The utmost he can expect us to believe is, that the tyrant's cruelty was subordinate to his policy. We might say rather his most sordid sense of interest. At this very time the abbots of Glastonbury and Colchester were cruelly murdered by the ministers of his despotic will. Not long before, Friar Forest had been burnt for teaching the supremacy. There had been a long series of such victims all through the reign. It is worth while noting how Mr. Froude narrates these horrid deeds. Far more important than the character of the dread tyrant of the sixteenth century is the tone in which his acts are spoken of in our own time by a most enlightened Anglican. It is often attempted to account for them, if not excuse them, by the spirit of the age in which they were committed. But this is a fallacy, and that it is so is shown by this very work of Mr. Froude; for he speaks of these things with evident approval, and a sympathy, not for their victims, but for their royal slaughterer. He brands as traitors all whom Henry slew. To have been slain by the tyrant is, in his mind, sufficient proof of treason! This is no exaggeration. We will sustain our statement to the letter, and by his own words. What could more clearly show that these horrors had not their origin in anything peculiar to the age? They arose simply from that same spirit of servility to royal tyranny which breathes in the pages of Mr. Froude. It is a spirit common to all times, and to which faith alone can rise superior; for it is the subserviency to the visible, the tem-

poral, in preference to the unseen, the spiritual, the eternal, which always, in all ages, is the prevailing sin of human nature. It was simply the worship of the *human* will; those who chose to worship it in the royal form, for the sake of what was visible, called it 'treason' to refuse it homage.

And so thinks the apologist of Anglicanism at this hour. It makes an idol of human authority embodied in a king. It bows down and worships "the state," as they of Babylon did the "golden image," which Nabuchodonosor, the king, had set up. It is precisely those who thus worship the visible and the human who are the most ready to persecute. It is only those who rely on force who persecute. Hence persecution has ever been a royal, not a papal policy. The power of the Pope is moral, like that of Christ his Lord. Christ's vicar would, indeed, fain rule all men, but as his Master, through the medium of faith, moving to a loving obedience. Not so the power that is earthly. It appeals to force, and must needs do so, for it has no moral power. Who could repose religious faith in aught of earth? This is what we meant when we said that persecution has been, in every age, the work of those most servile to human policy or human authority.

But let us see how Mr. Froude tells some of the stories of kingly persecution. With his hero it is not persecution. Oh no. 'Tis the just punishment of "treason." It was treason, as we shall see, to thwart in the least the tyrant's will, and for such treason the due penalty was death. "In the spring of 1537 Woburn Abbey was in high confusion. The brethren were trimming to the times, anxious merely for secular habits, wines, and freedom. In the midst of them, Robert Hobbes, the abbot, who, in the past year had accepted the oath of supremacy in a moment of weakness, was lying worn down with sorrow, unable to endure the burden of his conscience; on Passion Sunday, dying, as it seemed, of a broken heart, he called the fraternity to his side, and exhorted them to charity, and prayed them to be obedient to their vows. Hard eyes and mocking lips were all the answers of the monks of Woburn. Then, being in a great agony, the abbot rose up in his bed, and cried out, and said: 'I would to God it would please Him to take me out of this wretched world, and I would I had died with the good men that have suffered death for holding with the Pope.' Abbot Hobbes had his wish. Spite-

ful tongues carried his words to the Council, and the law, remorseless as destiny, flung its meshes over him on the instant. He was swept up to London, and interrogated in the usual form. Was he the king's subject, or the Pope's? He stood to his faith like a man, and the scaffold swallowed him up." Scarce a word of reprobation. The phraseology employed by Mr. Froude, on the contrary, implies a kind of recognition of legality. "The *law.*" It was the law which did it. The law! What law? A law unknown to England until within the last few years. "A law" imposed upon a nation by a tyrant's will! "A law" passed by terror, and enforced with blood. It was the *king's* law. The arbitrary edict of a tyrant, tamely registered and executed by a tyrant's slaves. Yet all that was so established, seems sanctified to your modern Anglican, who, without remorse, nay, with proud contempt, casts his scorn on the spiritual authority consecrated by the willing homage of all Christendom for thrice five hundred years! What slavish servility to human tyranny! What a miserable *superstition* for human law!

But let us follow Mr. Froude. Elsewhere the admiration which he feels for kingly tyranny is more fully expressed. "Forest, the late Prior of the Observant's convent, at Greenwich, in his office of confessor, was found to have instructed his penitents that he had denied the Bishop of Rome in his outward, but not in his inward man, and he had encouraged them, notwithstanding their oath, to persevere in their old allegiance. He had thus laid himself open to a prosecution for treason, and whatever penalty was due to an avowal of being the Pope's liege man, had been clearly earned by his treachery." (Although his pretended conformity had been caused by the terror of the tyrant's power.) "He declared his belief that in matters spiritual the Pope was his proper sovereign; in matters secular his duty was to his prince. But, on the threshold of the exception lay the difficulty which no Catholic would evade. What was the duty of a subject when a king was excommunicated, and declared to have forfeited his Crown? Forest, therefore, fell justly under the treason laws." This is Mr. Froude's deliberate judgment. The poor friar was hung for denying that the king was head of the Church, and he "fell justly under the treason law." The old English law of treason, and the present law of treason, applying only to a levying war against the sove-

reign, a rebellion, or a "compassing the king's death," and the "treason law" enacted by the tyrant, denouncing the doom of treason against those who should deny his spiritual supremacy! According to this the Puritans were as much traitors as the Papists, and are so at this hour. Mr. Froude, to veil the absurdity of his idea, talks of the difficulty which no Catholic could evade. What was the duty of a subject when a king was excommunicated, and declared to have forfeited his Crown? Why, there is no need to "evade" the difficulty, for difficulty there is none. The duty of a Catholic, to a Catholic monarch excommunicated, was recognized to be, to obey the royal authority in all things temporal. That is all. A sovereign put out of the Church, is just a sovereign not in the Church, and therefore not entitled to the sanction of the Church for his authority, nor to the exercise of those powers or privileges with regard to religion, which she allows to those who are. But, because a sovereign is not in the pale of the Church, it does not follow that he is not a sovereign. Because the Pope declined to enforce obedience to his spiritual authority, it did not follow that men were free to disobey. Because allegiance was no longer of religious obligation, it was not lawful for men to plunge the realm in anarchy. The sovereign had the human title, though he had not the divine. The Church took away what it had given, and left the human authority as she found it. The pagan kings had *that*, and she did not interfere with it, on the contrary, taught obedience. It is an error to say that the pope declared the king to have forfeited his crown. What was declared was, that he had forfeited that right to it which the *Church* had given. She conferred a divine title by consecration. *That* was withdrawn; the human title remained. Men did not necessarily by disobeying him commit a sin. But neither did they necessarily not commit a sin in so doing. It might be their duty to disobey him. It was so when religion was concerned. Therefore, Forest the Friar did so. Mr. Froude says, that by so doing he "justly fell under the treason law." So thought Cranmer, who consulted with the cruel tyrant about it; so thought Latimer, who preached at the pious martyrdom. And at Oxford there is a monument to Latimer and Cranmer, as 'martyrs!' Mr. Froude remembered that, and so deemed it necessary to make out that Forest's martyrdom was no murder.

Hence he maintains that the friar "justly fell under the treason laws." And then, he speaks of "superstition!" Why, what 'superstition can be grosser than this worship of a tyrant's will as 'law,' this homage to an earthly king as to an idol!

But let us see how our Anglican author narrates the horrible murders of the abbots in 1539. "The great abbots, with but few exceptions, had given cause for suspicion, that is, they had grown to advanced age as faithful subjects of the Papacy. Information had transpired—I do not know the precise nature of it—to persuade Cromwell that the abbots of Reading, Colchester, and Glastonbury, were entangled in some treasonable enterprise or correspondence." Treasonable, that is, in the Anglican sense, in the sense which Mr. Froude explains in a note, "The three abbots had joined in a conspiracy to *restore the Pope*," an extract from a letter to Bullinger, as if it were a "conspiracy" to concert measures for restoring the spiritual authority of the Holy See. Mr. Froude does not know what the abbots had done. "The charges against the Abbot of Reading I have not been able to find. The Abbot of Colchester had refused to surrender his house, had concealed or made away with the abbey plate, and had used expressions of anxiety for the success of the rebellion," which he might well have done, seeing that the object was to procure a free parliament and other salutary measures (Froude, iii. 161.) acceded to by the Council. So that the abbots could not be said to have "fallen under the treason law." Nor does Mr. Froude venture to say so. Yet "they were both executed." That is all he says about the fate of the two first. What he says about the third betrays his own ideas about the deed. "Whiting, Abbot of Glastonbury, had not distinguished himself as a champion of the falling faith. Cromwell's distrust waawakened by some unknown reason. Perhaps some discontented monk had sent up secret information." (What a system of treachery and espionage these allusions indicate. And see what follows. It shows plainly enough what was the real offence of the poor abbot.) "An order is sent for an enquiry into his conduct. His private apartments were searched, and a book of arguments was found there against the king's divorce, copies of bulls, a life of Thomas à Becket, nothing particularly criminal, though all indicating the Abbot's tendencies. The visitors considered them

discoveries in great matter." (The sequel shows why.) "The abbot was again questioned, and his answers appeared to them traitorous. He was sent to the Tower. The occasion of his absence was taken for the dissolution of the house, and as the first preliminary, an inventory was made of the plate." It was not to be found. "For, seeing the impending destruction of the establishment, the monks had everywhere been making use of their opportunities of plunder." What the Anglican means by 'plunder' our readers will be amused to hear: "The altar plate, in some few instances, may have been secreted from a sentiment of piety, from a desire to preserve from sacrilege vessels consecrated to holy uses. But, plunder was the rule, piety was the exception. A confession of the Abbot of Barking contains a frank avowal of the principles on which the fraternities generally acted." The good abbot called his convent into the chapter-house, and addressed them thus: "Brethren, ye hear how other religious be treated, and how they have but forty shillings a piece given them, and are let go. But they that have played the wise men among them have provided beforehand for themselves. Wherefore this is my counsel, that we do take such plate as we have, and set them aside, and sell them if need be, and so divide the money when the house is suppressed." That is to say, that the plate should be set aside, and in case the house was suppressed, should be sold, in order that it might be rescued from the hands of sacrilegious spoilers, and the proceeds divided among the rightful owners, when they should be thrust out to starve. There is not much dependence to be placed on "confessions" to a tyrant's ministers, put forth by them. But if the Abbot of Barking gave this counsel to his monks, it was very good counsel, and it is not unlikely that it was given by other abbots, and acted upon by other convents. At all events plate was found secreted at Glastonbury. "The visitors," says Mr. Froude, "did not trouble themselves to speculate on the abbot's intentions. There was nothing to show that in collusion with the brethren he was *not* repeating the behaviour of the Abbot of Barking," (what a curious way of putting it!) "his motives were of no moment. The fact of the concealment was patent, a letter communicated the discovery to the government; another followed, stating that the visitors had "come to the knowledge of divers and sundry treasons committed

by the abbot, the certainty whereof would appear by a Book of Depositions, which they forwarded,—'very haut and rank treasons.'" "I have not discovered this 'Book of Depositions,'" says Mr. Froude, "but those who desire to elevate the Abbot of Glastonbury to the rank of the martyr, confess their belief in doing so, that he was more faithful to the Church than to the State, that he was guilty of regarding the old ways as better than the new, and they need not care to question that he may have acted on his convictions, or at least have uttered them in words." He adds, "An ascertained disposition of disloyalty was enough to ensure a conviction;" and then, as if to dissipate or divert the sensations of horror which might steal over the reader's mind, as he thought of the poor abbot's fate, the Anglican author somewhat artfully adds: "the Pope, by his latest conduct, had embittered the quarrel to the utmost: he had failed to excite a holy war against England; but three English merchants had been burnt by the Inquisition, in Spain," (as if the Pope had anything to do with what passed in a country under the domination of his most dangerous opponent and oppressor—the Emperor!) "and Paul III. had issued a promise of indulgence to all pious Catholics who would kill an English heretic!" Startled at this most monstrous and mendacious statement, the reader may for a moment not observe the artful design, to divert his attention from, or dissipate his sympathy for, the sad fate of the abbots. But, on looking at the authority, or rather the *pretext*, for the shameless assertion, we find something if possible still more shameless and audacious, for we see, as the sole pretence for the statement, a citation from a letter of Cromwell's to the king! "The emperor," wrote Cromwell to Henry, "hath not consented that the Pope's mandate should be published in his dominions, that Englishmen should be destroyed wheresoever found, as the Pope would they should be." This is the mere statement of Cromwell, the remorseless minister of the tyrant's will, to his remorseless master himself; a secret statement, an exparte statement, wherein he says, not professing to know anything (as what could he know?) of any such mandate except by rumour, even if he had heard anything about it at all, which we doubt, and which is not proved by his letter, for he had an obvious motive, that bad and unprincipled man, to do his utmost to keep up in Henry's mind that animosity to the Papacy,

to which this upstart minister owed entirely his own elevation, and the disappearance of which would be his own doom. And a writer of history does not scruple to palm off upon us as an 'authority,' forsooth, for an imputation of the foulest nature on the character of the Pontiff,—this secret statement, which *could* be but the hearsay, and most probably was the pure invention of a tyrant's minister, written to his master for the manifest purpose of perpetuating that unhappy alienation from the Pontiff, on which his own influence and power depended!

But, to return to the Abbot of Glastonbury, from whose fate the Anglican admirer of the tyrant and his tools, desires to divert our attention and our sympathy. This very Cromwell was at that very time eagerly engaged in the foul plot to murder him for the sake of his abbey plate; "among the papers of Cromwell (says Mr. Froude) there is a memorandum, in his own hand, for the trial *and execution* of the abbot." Well may he observe, "his escape was not contemplated on as a possibility." No, there was no escape for the poor abbot. And to the Anglican apologist we might say, "your fathers killed the prophets, and you have digged their graves." And dug their graves in calumny, seeking to cloak and cover the horror of their doom by a most unworthy sophistry. Our author actually is not ashamed to apologize for the abbot's murder. He excuses it because the abbot had secreted the plate! "No government," he thinks, "could tolerate conduct of this kind!" "For members of religious houses to make away their plate was justly construed felony!" There is a dishonest ambiguity in this sentence, which is open to the construction that it means a making away with the plate by *individuals*. But, to mean anything to the purpose, it must mean that a disposition of the plate by the abbot, and the whole of the monks, was felonious!

The eagerness of Mr. Froude to apologize for tyranny has led him from sophistry into sheer absurdity. Why, the abbot and his monks constituted a corporate body, having in the plate an absolute legal property, with the absolute power of disposition incident to legal property. Mr. Froude alludes to their interest in it as only a "life interest." Of course it could only be enjoyed for life, for the simple reason that all men must die; but they had the absolute property in their plate and in their lands, and if they chose, could sell the one or the other; at law their

power to do so was unlimited, for they were absolute legal owners, and their exercise of the right was only subject to the control of their spiritual superiors, so that Mr. Froude's whole notion of felony is a ridiculous figment. He thinks, however, that there was no "unfair dealing" with the poor abbot. "Lord Russell, whose *stainless character* was worthy of his name," (what a flagrant piece of flattery to a living Russell—what an unconscious sarcasm upon the Sir John Russell of history, Henry's servile minion!) was one of the commissioners before whom the trial was conducted, and he has left on record his approval of, and acquiescence in the conduct of the case, in plain and unmistakeable language. The Anglican author is, however, ashamed to quote the language. We will do so. "Whiting was arraigned at Wells, before as worshipful a jury as was charged there for many years," wrote Russell to Cromwell. "The crime of which he was formally accused was robbing the abbey church, and there is no doubt that he was guilty of having committed that crime, to whatever the guilt may have amounted!" The 'crime' of trying to preserve from sacrilegious spoilers the plate of his own abbey! "He was sentenced to death, and the day following was fixed for the execution. He was taken with the two monks (his treasurers) from Wells to Glastonbury. He was drawn through the town in the usual manner, and thence to the top of the hill, which rises out of the level of the plain of Somersetshire, called Glastonbury Torre." And so he met his shocking fate, to which, in the judgment of our modern Anglican, he was justly sentenced! The king was eager for the victim's spoil; his minions were servile to his will, as servile as our author would have been had he lived in those days,—as servile as the Russell he eulogises, and the Cromwell he admires, in the service of the tyrant whom he deems a hero!

No wonder that Russell rose in the king's favour; no wonder that he finds an eulogist in the apologist of his master; no wonder Henry upheld the 'Reformers,' despite his own hatred to their heresy. The bloody 'six articles' showed that hatred. His shrinking from enforcing the act arose not from clemency, but policy. They were his allies, and he durst not drive them to desperation. At that very time he was engaged in intrigues with the Reformers in Scotland, and pledging himself to support the 'gospellers,' the teachers of 'the pure evangel.' (Froude, iv. 311.)

He was intriguing to destroy the government of Cardinal Beaton, if necessary, by his assassination. Mr. Froude states, that in 1544, a Scot, named Wishart, came to the Marquis of Hertford, with an offer to raise a force to arrest and imprison the principal opponents of the English alliance, and either apprehend or slay the Cardinal himself." Hertford, declining to give an answer on his own responsibility, referred the messenger to the king, and Henry "saw no reason to discourage the dispatch of a public enemy." Nor does Mr. Froude see why he should. Nor did the 'Reformers.' 'Wishart' was the so-called martyr. "I see no reason to believe," says Mr. Froude, "that the martyr of St. Andrew's was so different from his Protestant countrymen as to have been unlikely to have been the messenger to Hertford, or to have sympathized cordially with the message." Mr. Froude informs us in a note "that the expedient of assassination was admitted, and approved in the sixteenth century, by the best men of all persuasions." We beg to make one exception. The assertion may be true enough of all Protestant persuasions, and also of those Catholics who were not faithful to the Papacy, unhappily by far the larger number. But it was not true of those faithful children of the Holy See, who alone were true Catholics. We defy any one to produce any sanction by Papal authority of the infamous doctrine of assassination. Elsewhere our author, to divert attention from the atrocities of his hero, resorts to his usual artifice of trying to impute some similar enormities to the holy Father, and introduces in a note the monstrous statement that the Popes sanctioned assassination-plots against Elizabeth, or the powder-plot against James. We need hardly add that he cites no authority for it; most of our readers are aware that there is no evidence that there was any plot to assassinate Elizabeth, and of the powder-plot, none which is credible, or that can be relied on—none that was not concocted by the Crown lawyers. But, as to any implication of the Pope in such conspiracies, it is a pure invention on the part of our author, without even the *pretence* of an authority. The only reason for suggesting it is the desire to mitigate our disgust at the cruel deeds of the tyrant whom he makes the hero of Anglicanism. But all his sophistry cannot remove from Henry's memory the infamy of suborning the assassination of those whom his own arm could not reach. Mr. Froude is compelled to confess that

it was so as regarded Cardinal Beaton. He gives also a letter of Cromwell's which contains a dark menace of a similar fate to Cardinal Pole.

Mr. Froude tells us, "Among the strange phenomena of the times, none is more remarkable than the popularity of Henry VIII. among the younger Italians," and "Henry found leisure to avail himself of the good will of his *friends* in their own country." "Ludovico de Arno, a Venetian nobleman, raised a *corps* of free lances for the English service, who, hovering on the skirts of the territory of the Republic, fluttered the dovecotes of the right reverend legislators. Reginald Pole, in mere terror of being clutched and carried off to England, would not adventure to join them until the Pope applied to De Arno for a passport. The passport was refused; he was forced to steal to the meeting-place of the cardinals in disguise, and even when arrived within the walls of Trent, he was still insecure, and lived only in incredible and continual fear." (Froude, iv. 414.) That is, fear of assassination, at the instigation of Henry, who murdered the Cardinal's mother, the venerable Countess of Salisbury, wreaking his baffled vengeance on the aged parent when he could not seize the son. And his minion, the infamous Cromwell, was not ashamed, in a letter set out by Mr. Froude, without a word of disapprobation, to menace Pole with assassination. "Whenever the king wills, his highness may bring it easily to pass that he shall think himself scarce sure of his life, although he went tied at his master's girdle. There may be found ways enough in Italy to rid a traitorous subject." (Froude, iii. 231.) What "ways" these were, the Anglican apologist discloses, not only without disapproval, but with complacent satisfaction, in the passage previously cited. He is quite proud of his hero for securing the services of a band of "free lances" to murder an illustrious exile. And then he has the insolence elsewhere to insinuate that popes had abetted assassination! He will search in vain in Catholic morality for refined subtleties to palliate such iniquities. It was by refusing to yield to them in truth that the popes had to encounter the hostility of kings. It is in the very nature of Anglicanism, which had its origin in the desire to pander to their crimes, to find apologies for them. And our author after all is true to his vocation.

Conscious of the liability to this reproach, our author,

like any Anglican, is eager upon every occasion, to seek to retort upon Rome the charge of servility to royalty. And in the very volume which contains a laboured apology for the divorce of Henry, occurs the following passage, (vol. iii. p. 321.) which affords a very apt illustration of the historical accuracy and *candour* of Mr. Froude:—

"Angus" (who had been married to Margaret, Henry's sister, widow of James IV.) "continued dominant until the summer of 1528. In the spring of that year* the court of Rome," which at the moment, we are assured by Catholic historians, "was engaged in defending the sacredness of matrimony against the licentious demands of Henry VIII., gave its sanction, nevertheless, to the most impudent request for a divorce ever presented in a court of justice, and forthwith the queen married Methuven." And then Mr. Froude inserts a note: "The divorce of Margaret from the Earl of Angus, demanded on the plea of the legend of the escape of James IV. from Flodden, was not huddled over in a provincial court in Scotland. It was decided in Italy, after two years deliberation." (The authority he cites is the state papers, i.e. the letters of Henry's unscrupulous emissaries!) And then he adds: "The moderate surprise which I experienced on reading the speeches of Roman Catholic members of Parliament, in the late debate on the Divorce Bill, was increased to wonder at the silence with which the assertions of the purity of the Papal courts were allowed to pass unchallenged." It may mitigate Mr. Froude's surprise when we expose the character of his own statement. "The marriage with Angus had been set aside by the Scottish ecclesiastics, long before 1528, and at a time when he was *dominant.*" The divorce from Angus was *not* on the plea of the legend of the escape of James IV. from Flodden, but upon the ground of a previous compact by Angus. The business was conducted in a "provincial court of Scotland," at all events, in the first instance; and the queen obtained the sanction of the local episcopate to it, as founded on just reasons, although, then, for two years afterwards, (that is, until as Mr. Froude himself states,

* In Pinkerton's appendix is a letter from the English envoy, dated in that year, speaking of the marriage, and without any expression of surprise, or still less of scorn.

until after the decree of Rome, the summer of 1528,) "Angus was *dominant*," his overthrow only taking place in that year. But what will our readers think of Mr. Froude's candour when we tell them that the divorce and re-marriage had the cordial sanction of Margaret's brother —our author's hero, Henry! In the midst of his laboured eulogies on Henry, he ascribes this transaction to the Pope, in order to heap obloquy upon Rome, and *conceals the fact* that it had the approval of the monarch he covers with eulogy!

It is singular that the sympathies—may we not say morbid sympathies of our author—are always on the side of bad men. Thus they are in this instance with Angus, as invariably they are with Henry; and as it would have been impossible to avow a sympathy with both, since here they were at variance. Henry, even although it was against his interest—for Angus was the head of the English interest—concurred in the propriety of the divorce from Angus, and the fact that he did so is concealed from the reader of Mr. Froude. The only importance of the fact is this, that it shows how strong that case must have been which had the reluctant approval of such a monarch as Henry, in opposition to his own interest. It happens that Angus was friendly to the policy of Henry, who had then thrown over the Papal Supremacy. So it became necessary for our author to represent Angus, as well as his patron, Henry, as a wise and good man; and hence we have no glimpse in these pages of those depravities which marked out Angus as one of the worst men of his country, and which even disgusted and alienated his patron, Henry. Sir Walter Scott was more honest, and quotes Pitscottie, who represents the head of the house of Douglas as going about with bands of "felons and of homicides." This reminds us of the unscrupulous manner in which Mr. Froude selects his 'authorities,' with such systematic seeking for falsities calculated to suit his purpose, as utterly deprives his work of the least historical weight or value.

An example is afforded in this very matter of Margaret and her marriage with Methuen. It is part of Mr. Froude's purpose to blacken her character, because she upheld the Church, just as it is his object to exalt the character of Angus, whose patron was our author's hero, Henry. Hence Mr. Froude on every occasion endea-

vours to brand her with infamy. And on *what authority?* The secret, *exparte*, hearsay statements of Henry's emissaries, written under the strongest possible bias, to form the plans and further the purposes of their employers. Henry, be it observed, was at enmity with his sister Margaret, and Wolsey, his minister, was labouring to advance his interest in that country, while he was seeking to maintain the *French* interest. Angus was the head of the *English* party, as Albany was of the *French*. The emissaries employed by Wolsey of course wrote to him in the spirit which would please him. And Mr. Froude quotes against Margaret such passages as this in one of Norfolk's letters to the Cardinal: "The grudge is universal against her for her ungodly living and infidelity;" or this: "The noblemen and commons do desire the amity of England, and the commons hate the Duke of Albany of all men living. The Earl of Angus is desired universally among them." (Norfolk, Dacre, and Magnus, to Wolsey, Froude, iv. 22, note.) Now this is of comparatively little importance as regards Margaret, whose character we are not particularly concerned to vindicate, only it contrasts curiously enough with our author's extreme nicety and jealousy about the historical credibility of any piece of evidence against *Henry*. But what is more important to observe is, that this most marked and manifest dishonesty pervades the entire of Mr. Froude's work, and attaches to his statements regarding personages whose characters are of infinitely greater value than Queen Margaret's. We pointed it out in our Review of the two first volumes, as regarded the character of Pope Clement VII., against whom Mr. Froude actually cites as authentic testimony,—the secret *exparte* statements made to Henry by his own emissaries, written to pander to his bad passions, or promote his vile purposes!

Throughout the work he pursues the same system, and utterly discarding, we will not say the evidence on the Catholic or Papal side, (to that he never adverts—that he studiously conceals or perverts,) he avoids any evidence which it is even *possible* may be indifferent or unbiassed, and selects his statements from sources *certain* to have the colour with which he desires to invest his story. Thus, he not only upholds Henry's cause, but takes care that Henry's emissaries shall supply all the *evidence*. A more barefaced disregard—one may almos

say of historical decency—it were hard to imagine. It is without parallel in any writer pretending to be impartial, or even desiring to be deemed honest. We have been referring to the Scottish portion of the history, and this reminds us that we do not find Mr. Froude quoting Bishop Leslie, whom Sir Walter Scott described as "an historian of credit and of eminence." Mr. Froude prefers to quote *John Knox!* whose vulgar bigotry the generous Sir Walter condemned, and whose testimony, even half a century ago, Dalrymple discarded with disgust. How low Mr. Froude has fallen in candour as an historian, or how retrograde is the historical literature of our age, this of itself would illustrate,—that an accomplished scholar like Mr. Froude, is not ashamed to take John Knox as an authority on the ecclesiastical character of Scotland, or the testimony of Henry's emissaries as regards the conduct of the Holy See!

"The English Government lavished large sums as secret service money on the European courts. Though occasionally misled by reports from other quarters, they were always *admirably informed* by their agents at Rome." (Froude, iii. 11.) That is 'admirably' *to their taste.* The emissaries and minions of a tyrant, writing to him or his ministers their secret accounts of conversations or of events, were pretty likely to season their stories, and colour their pictures as much as possible, in accordance with his feelings and desires.

Mr. Froude's merits as an historian and as a moralist may be tested in a very striking way, with reference to the case of Catherine Howard. In July, 1540, occurred the fall of Cromwell, the head of the Protestant party. In August the king married the niece of the Duke of Norfolk, who was the head of the *Catholic* party. The duke had been, as all Catholics were, delighted at, and aided in the ruin of the unscrupulous minister. And the king's marriage with his niece was regarded by the Catholics as a triumph to their cause. For it afforded obviously great facilities of acquiring influence with the king, through a Catholic consort, in favour of reunion with Rome. But, in pursuance of this object, of course there would be communications with the Queen from Cardinal Pole, or the Pope, which were now perilous. Such was the king's jealousy of intercourse with Rome, that it had, in numerous instances, served as proof of treason, and was yet to do

so as in the cases of Catherine's uncle and cousin, the Duke of Norfolk and his son, the ill-fated Lord Surrey. This is the key to all that so speedily and fatally followed in the history of the unhappy queen. It might be expected that she was regarded by the Protestant faction with inveterate aversion, and her downfall eagerly desired; but no historian has yet unravelled fully the foul means employed, nor done justice to the diabolical craft and cruelty of Cranmer. That he was the prime mover in this satanic conspiracy against the poor queen is plain. The origin can be traced to him. The opportunity for its machination was afforded by the king's absence in the North. "During the king's absence, a gentleman named Lascelles," says Mr. Froude, who in a note intimates that he was a person who had bitterly lamented Cromwell's fall as a loss to the Protestant interest, "came *to the archbishop*," who had been of course the close ally of Cromwell. That is to say, the archbishop and he *had come together*, with what fatal result was too soon seen, "and told him" (that is, they agreed that the archbishop should *say* that Lascelles had told him,) "that his sister had been in the household of the Duchess of Norfolk," (where the queen had been brought up,) "that she had told him that the queen had, before her marriage, disgraced herself." *Two* persons were named,—not merely one, but two, as the accomplices of this ante-nuptial immorality. Mark with what consummate art the conspiracy was arranged, and the instruments and victims selected.

The *archbishop* is found communicating this pretended discovery to the king. Why? Supposing he deemed it true, it was *ante-nuptial*, and could constitute no legal offence; its concealment, therefore, could not be improper,—its disclosure could not be necessary, and could only create mischief. But its communication to the king of course aroused his jealousy, and it enabled the conspirators at once to seize and imprison the two persons referred to, Denham and Mannock. Two other persons are immediately after arrested, Culpepper and Lord Rochford. And the queen is imprisoned. The tyrant had been artfully exasperated against her, and she at once separated from him, and from her fellow victims, who fell a speedy prey. From that time she was never seen—save by the king's minions—until she came forth to die. She was never confronted with witness, or with accuser. But

when she, like her destined victims, had been incarcerated, the preconcerted story was put forth, that she had been guilty of adultery, not with one person, but with several, and with the privity of several others, in the most barefaced manner. A story as improbable as it was foul. The only fact on which it was affected to rest, was the undoubted fact that Derham and Mannock, with the concurrence of Lords Rochford and Culpepper, who was in the king's household, had interviews with the queen at night. It is *incredible* that this was for purposes of sin. The interviews are easily accountable for, on the hypothesis already suggested, that there were secret communications going on between the Catholic Queen and Cardinal Pole, and that these people were assisting in that perilous correspondence. There was nothing in the facts not explainable on that supposition,—there was not any evidence of the suggested crime. The other actors in the conspiracy, beside Cranmer, were those infamous creatures, Audley and Wriothesley. The poor prisoners were in their custody. We can fancy what took place in the Tower. No one can doubt the use of torture. That it was common at that time is notorious. That this was a case in which it would be used cannot be questioned. To the king the pretence would be to elicit disclosures. But the real reason would be to drive the unhappy wretches to plead guilty. Lingard states that torture was used. It might safely be inferred, that it was so. It was usual.

But when men are arrested and imprisoned on one charge, which involves no legal crime, and when being so immured are accused of another, and a capital offence, without being confronted with their accusers, or with any witnesses and when they are in the custody of those who have an interest in their being convicted, and those persons without principle or scruple, the circumstances surely lead, if not to a clear conclusion, at least to a vehement suspicion. It was necessary to get Derham and Culpepper out of the way, on the plea of guilt, in order to prepare the way for the projected sacrifice of the queen. If any of those were allowed to live, who were privy to the secret interviews, she could not be ruined on a false charge which they would refute. Hence the net was spread large enough to embrace all who took part in those interviews, all were immured, and all were murdered. The grave closed over them; the chief victim could then be safely sacrificed, and

the object of the conspiracy was successfully achieved, and it was hoped, concealed. And its traces were sufficiently concealed in that age of terror, when men durst not whisper suspicions of foul play. But, by those who now read the dread tragedy the traces of the conspiracy can be detected in the assassin-like precautions which were observed, the stealthy secrecy, the *darkness* which veiled its course. Mr. Froude, with that unfairness which characterises him, studiously conceals all the circumstances which clearly sustain the theory we have suggested, and tend to show the interviews with the queen innocent; as for instance, the fact that Culpepper was a *relation* of hers, and above all, that she employed Derham *as her secretary*. Now, Mr. Froude could not be ignorant of this. It is in the "state papers," which he professes to have studied so closely; it is pointed out by the learned and acute Lingard. And how it bears upon the theory of a secret intercourse with Rome, he saw, no doubt clearly enough, when he suppressed it in his history.

Nor is it merely by suppression that he seeks to distort or conceal the truth. He says that they pleaded guilty. This can hardly be, for in the state papers it appears that the judges were consulted *as to the proof against them*. This also is pointed out by Lingard, who observes: "It has been said that they confessed the adultery. But of this there is no proof; and it cannot be doubted that, if it were so, their confession would be stated in the bill of attainder," as it was not. The same argument applies to the queen. She *had no trial*. The bill of attainder was passed behind her back, after those who could have testified the truth had been themselves executed. She never was brought face to face with any witness.

The bill passed while she was in prison. The king's creature, Cranmer, and his brother-in-law Suffolk, with Southampton, waited upon her in order to trump up some story of a "confession;" but the only "confession" which they pretended to bring (who can place any credit on the pretence of a "confession" professedly received in secret by the creature of the prosecutor, and then orally reported for his purpose? who can hear without contempt for such a barefaced outrage upon justice?) the pretended "confession," as they stated it was, "that she acknowledged *her offence* against God, the king, and the country; not "the offence" with which she was charged, although Mr.

Froude, deliberately falsifying the entry on the roll of parliament, states it in that form, showing thereby that he sees the important difference between the two statements: the true one being quite reconcilable with the theory that the only offence was the secret intercourse with Rome. As Dr. Lingard remarks with his great shrewdness, "can we believe that if she could have been brought to confess the crime charged, Suffolk would not have stated it unequivocally? Again, why was this statement withheld till the house had passed the bill? It is also singular that the statement of the Earl of Southampton who had accompanied Suffolk to the queen, was omitted. The clerk has begun the entry with these words, "*hoc etiam adjiciens*," but, unaccountably, adds nothing. Thus far Lingard; the passage is as good an illustration of the minute accuracy and keen observation of the Catholic historian as the manner in which Mr. Froude deals with it is equally characteristic of his want of candour. "Southampton added a few words which are not preserved." A pure invention, or at the best a forced assumption, quite in the teeth of the obvious reference from the significant circumstance noted by Lingard, for why should not the clerk have finished the entry if Southampton had stated anything? The natural inference is, that, for some reason he shrank from doing so, that he boggled and faltered in the foul cruel work he was engaged in. But Mr. Froude insists in putting words into his mouth although there is no proof that he ever uttered any words at all. The Anglican author is anxious to make the worst of the miserable parade of a pretended confession. But at the best, and at the utmost, what did it amount to? Simply nothing. If it came to anything, who could credit it on the simple assertion of the tyrant's servile tools? But it came to nothing, no more than the queen's vague confession on the scaffold, where she acknowledged herself against God from her youth upward, "false against the king's majesty very dangerously;" an expression, this last, hardly appropriate to adultery, but very suggestive of the idea that the only offence was secret intercourse with Rome, which the king would, as she well knew, interpret as traitorous and "very dangerous." The sequel makes this more clear. For not a long while afterwards Norfolk narrowly escaped, and his son Henry actually underwent the same fate, mainly on the very

ground of intrigues with Rome. Even at the time of the arrest of his niece, the Duke was suspected as he well knew, and trembled for his own fate. The real character of the conspiracy against the queen he knew, but he durst not reveal it, for it would have implicated himself. He probably had been privy to the secret correspondence between her and Rome. As the head of the Papal party he naturally would be. To have divulged it, however, would have been to sacrifice himself, without perhaps saving the queen. His own fate and his son's a little later showed this. Her enemies were his, and they had both in their power. And they used the consciousness of this power to inspire her with terror. There could not be a position fraught with greater horror. He had to appear to take a part in the destruction of his own niece. His enemies took a terrible revenge for the ruin of Cromwell. They repeated the tragedy of Anne Boleyn, but reversed the application. Mr. Froude betrays his own supicion of the horrible retaliation. "The tide" (he says) "had turned. It was now a Protestant Princess (Ann of Cleves) who had been divorced and her place had been taken by a representative of a party who, if not Romanists, rivalled them in hatred of the Reformers." And then a little further on, "a signal and tremendous retaliation followed." It was indeed a "retaliation." A more terrible one history never recorded, or rather shrowded. For the vile conspiracy which resulted in it, is detected by the very darkness in which it was sought to conceal it. It is as clear as such dark crimes can ever be, that Catherine Howard's death was the result of the dark intrigues of Cranmer in revenge for the fall of Cromwell, and the first of a long series of similar murders such as that of Lord Stafford in a later age, perpetrated under pretence of "conspiracy" to restore Romanism; but really in order to wreak their revenge or calm the fears of Protestants.

There is nothing so timorous as guilt; there is nothing so cruel as fear. In the declining years of the tyrant he grew more fearful and more cruel, because more conscious of his guilt. And his minions were more and more apprehensive of an hour in which remorse might ripen into repentance, and result in reconciliation with Rome. Hence they sought from time to time to plunge him still deeper in a sea of blood, and by slaying fresh victims to harden his heart, and still it equally against pity and remorse. Nor-

folk and Surrey were the next victims to this horrible apprehensiveness of guilt. They were to be murdered for fear they should restore the realm of Rome. But none of these atrocities stagger the Anglican apologist. He wades with unmoved nerve through the sea of blood which Henry shed, and speaks with perfect calmness of his innumerable victims, however illustrious, or eminent, or pious. Nay, not only does he face with cool unshrinking eye all these horrors, but he underrates them, he apologizes for them all. Those unnatural deeds of blood which have even moved to horror the philosophical composure of Hume, or in our own times have aroused the more generous indignation of a Hallam, meet, in the pages of an Anglican author, only excuse, palliation, or apology. Even the brutal murder of the venerable Marchioness of Salisbury, the ruthless slaughter of the gay and gallant Surrey, all is indicated with the same obsequious sophistry. Mr. Froude cannot see the absurdity of charging the heir of the house of Norfolk with treason, merely on such frivolous pretexts as these, that he had aspired to the regency in the event of the king leaving his son a minor, or that he had presumed to bear royal arms. He takes care to eke out the accusations against the Earl. "It was proved, more suspiciously, that one of his servants had been in secret communication with Cardinal Pole in Italy." "It was said that Gardiner had planned a secret scheme for the restoration of the Papal authority in England; that Norfolk was privy to the intention," &c. No doubt the real motives of the attainder of the Duke and his son, are revealed here, in the tyrant's jealous hate of the Papacy and all who still clung to its authority. But as the tyrant strove to invent some show of other reason for the ruthless slaughter which he meditated, so his apologist strives with all his strength of sophistry, to make good the miserable pretexts. If Mr. Froude does not know that the execution of Surrey was a murder, it is time that he learnt a little law, so much at least most writers of history possess. If he does know it, and surely he can scarcely fail to do so, what can we think of the candour of the Anglican historian?

He had evidently formed a deliberate design of representing Henry VIII. as in the main a great and good man, and he has adhered to it without scruple, at any sacrifice of historical credibility. He has admitted his

design, and gives the clearest clue to his mode of executing it. "I have endeavoured to reinstate the judgment upon his motives and his actions which was entertained by all moderate Englishmen in his own and the succeeding generation;" a time in which of course it was more than a man's life was worth, (as every man found who dared to try it,) to speak otherwise than in terms of slavish eulogy of the tyrant or his measures! It is really a satire on the historical knowledge of his readers, that Mr. Froude should rely upon their being ignorant or oblivious of this notorious fact. But he contrives to colour the character of Henry with something of an heroic hue, to vindicate all his actions, or to palliate the little which he does not vindicate, by adopting a very simple but a very unscrupulous course, of invariably representing his conduct, and the conduct of his victims, in the light in which his own ministers or minions represented both the one and the other. Thus, for example, in order to support his own version of the story of Surrey's execution, that it was *not* "a gratuitous murder," he quotes a letter to one of the king's minions, Paget, from one of his courtly servile prelates, the Bishop of Westminster, (there being in fact no "Bishop of Westminster" in any other sense than as the mere nominee of the tyrant, there being no See of Westminster, the bishopric having been created by the king out of part of the spoils of the abbey, just to save appearances with the people,) who writes of course in the most slavish strain of servile eulogy about the manifold virtues of his royal master. As if the very fate of Surrey did not show that men were not safe unless they spoke in terms of slavish servility of the jealous and ferocious tyrant. As if any man who had not the courage of a martyr would venture to speak the truth about him! Yet with an effrontery altogether amusing, our Anglican apologist professes, as historical verities, the self-interested flatteries of Henry's subjects, nay, of his minions and his ministers, the instruments and tools of his rapacious tyranny! And then with an admirable assumption of credit for zeal for historical truth, the author says, "It has been mine to search for the facts among statutes and state papers, misinterpreted through natural prejudice and imperfect knowledge." "Statutes and state papers!" Statutes passed by parliaments servile to his will; "state papers" written by his creatures and his slaves! Statutes passed by parliaments

which spoiled the monasteries, (after solemnly declaring that in them religion was right well observed,) passed laws for the burning of Catholics and heretics at the king's dictation, and at his bidding attainted men for treason who had murmured at his tyranny, nay, had denounced as treason adultery in a woman whom they at the same time affirmed had never been his lawful wife! "State papers" drawn up by such men as Cranmer, or Cromwell, or Bonner, or Gardiner; such state papers as the letter of the Bishop of Westminster to the favourite Paget, or letters written from the minions of a tyrant to his minister or himself, teeming with fulsome flatteries, and malignant falsities upon his enemies, composed to pander to his bad passions or answer his vile ends. Admirable materials for history! Trustworthy testimony on which to represent the characters of the tyrant's antagonists! Truly original idea! to make the murderers write the lives of their victims! And yet our Anglican apologist actually takes credit for it, thinks he has earned some title to attention by it, fancies that he has discovered fresh sources of information, new avenues to truth! Why we venture with some contempt to assert that the great bulk of the work is founded upon materials which no impartial historian would deem admissible or credible at all! The first and most obvious dictate of common sense in regard to history, is to discard all statements interested, biassed, or coerced, made under any undue influence, or for any indirect purpose, and never to admit, in a matter of controversy, a man's own statements, or his defendants, as evidence in his own favour, but on the contrary, always to remember that they may furnish the best and fairest evidence against himself. But our Anglican apologist has inverted the rule as regards the tyrant, whom he has delighted to honour; and he has taken for Gospel all that the tyrant, or his minions, said of himself or of his victims! Hence undoubtedly there is, in a certain bad sense, an originality in the work, for no one until now has had the hardihood to attempt such an outrage on the very decency of history.

Mr. Froude confesses, in fact it is his boast, that the staple of his book consists of the state papers and the recitals of the statutes. The state papers, the writings of Henry himself, or his ministers; the statutes, passed by servile parliaments composed of his creatures. He assures us that, in the course of his study of these materials, the

impression he had inherited unfavourable to the character of Henry's reign "melted away," and that "with it disappeared that fact so difficult to credit, and yet as it seemed so hard to deny, that English parliaments, English judges, English clergy and statesmen, whose beneficial legislation survives among the most valued of our institutions, prelates who were the founders and the martyrs of the English church, were the cowardly accomplices of abominable atrocities, and had disgraced themselves with a sycophancy which the Roman senate imperfectly approached when it fawned on Nero." This passage may serve as the key to the scheme and scope of the work before us. The author had felt that the origin of the Reformation was inseparably and necessarily associated with the character of Henry, because its initiative step, the separation from Rome, was his work, achieved for his purposes. Hence it became, in his opinion, essential, in order to maintain the moral character of the Reformation, to maintain the character of Henry. And to do so he was driven to that for which he takes such credit, as giving an originality and authenticity to his work; his researches into the state papers. In other words, he has recourse to the representations of Henry and his minions in order to depict the character of Henry's reign. He was driven to this, for he well knew that any other authority would reveal its true character in all its horrible atrocity. But from these polluted sources he knew he was sure to derive ample store of sophistry with which to veil the most execrable deeds of blood, pretences and professions with which to disguise the horror of the most horrid acts of tyranny, or palliate them with the tyrant's plea, necessity. And he is prepared to take the same course in his future volumes. "The year which followed witnessed the alternate supremacy of factions, where selfishness walked hand in hand with fanaticism, where petty passions disguised themselves under sacred names, and the just discontent of the nation with the Reformers was allayed only at last when reaction had brought with it a bitter recompense of persecution, and the spirit of the dead king revived in Elizabeth." Mr. Froude avows himself of opinion that those who did not agree in the royal definition of allegiance justly suffered the doom of treason. And like Lord J. Russell, he is evidently prepared to vindicate all the horrible cruelties of Elizabeth upon the plea of expediency. No government,

he repeatedly affirms, could allow itself to be attacked with impunity, yet he alludes in the usual hackneyed style to the massacre of St. Bartholomew's, not allowing to a Catholic king the benefit of his own measures of policy and expediency. His casuistry is simple though somewhat onesided; it is that all atrocities are made lawful by a Protestant expediency, and that Protestantism is an end which always sanctifies the means. He approves of, and apologises for, the murder of Exeter, and Montague, and Surrey, and a host of others, merely for saying that they did not like the king's proceedings, and desired a re-union with Rome; and then on the strength of the enforced flatteries and lavish eulogies of men living under such a reign of terror, he asks us, for the credit of the Reformation, to reckon the tyrant as the model of a Christian king!

ART. IX—"*The Tablet*," of May 29 and June 5, 1858. Dublin.

THE successive numbers of our able contemporary just named, will be found to contain a correspondence between the Visiting Priest of Pentonville Prison, and the present Secretary of State for the Home Department, which throws light upon the religious condition of the Catholic inmates of that establishment, while it exhibits, in rather a striking manner, the extent of ignorance, or misapprehension which prevails in official quarters as to the real character of the grievances which we allege as existing in this and similar departments of public administration. The request preferred by the Visiting Priest of Pentonville, to the Home Secretary, the supreme authority in matters relating to the Government Prisons or Houses of Correction, was one which we should have thought could neither be refused nor misunderstood. It was merely this; that whereas the existing rules of the prison permit the Visiting Priest to see such prisoners only as make special application for his services, and whereas the number of those who make such application is, from whatever cause, very small, while the number of Catholics in the

prison is, on the other hand, very considerable, the Visiting Priest should have the power of attending all Catholic prisoners *registered as such upon their admission*, whether or not they should happen to take the initiative in requesting to see him. To this Mr. Secretary Walpole replies in the following courteous, but decisive terms.

"Whitehall, May 8th, 1858

"Sir,—I am directed by Mr. Secretary Walpole to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 15th ult., stating that the regulations of Pentonville Prison restrict your ministerial visits to such Roman Catholic prisoners only as expressly desire them, and requesting that the Secretary of State will give directions for permitting the visits of a Roman Catholic priest to all prisoners in that establishment who are registered as Roman Catholics.

"Mr. Walpole desires me to inform you that he finds, upon inquiry, that consistently with the observance of order and discipline within the prison in question, the present rules and practice do give, and are intended to give, the fullest effect, not only to the letter, but to the spirit of the act, by which all prisoners of a different persuasion from that of the Established Church may have the attendance of a minister of their own religion whenever they may reasonably desire it.

"Mr. Walpole begs me to assure you that every facility has been, is, and will be, given by the prison authorities to enable the Roman Catholic prisoners to see their ministers at all reasonable times, but that Pentonville Prison, being a prison founded on the separate system, it would be impossible, without overturning that system, to allow the prisoners to assemble, as in associated prisons, for the purpose of general Communion and public ministration.

"In conclusion, I am directed to state that Mr. Walpole is of opinion that to extend the rules and present practice, as you desire, so as to give the Roman Catholic priests a discretionary power of visiting the prison, would be fatal to all prison discipline, and lead to inconvenience, disturbance, and irregularity, which it is his bounden duty to discourage and prevent.—I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

"H. WADDINGTON.

"The Rev. F. Oakeley, 39, Duncan Terrace, Islington, N."

We give, next in order, the reply to this letter.

"39, Duncan Terrace, Islington, N., 19th May, 1858.

"Sir—I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 8th inst., in answer to mine of the 15th ult., requesting your interposition in obtaining for me, as visiting Roman Catholic priest at Pentonville, facilities of access to prisoners of the Roman

Catholic faith, inmates of that establishment, whom the actual regulations of the prison do not allow me to visit.

"While I must deeply regret that you do not feel able, consistently with your duty, to grant my prayer, I am bound to acknowledge the courtesy with which you have received it, and the fulness with which you have stated the reasons which induce you to think that any extension of liberty in this matter would be inexpedient.

"With the view, not of questioning your decision, but of removing all misapprehension as to the nature of my request, I take the liberty of submitting most respectfully the following explanation:—

"You observe that, to grant my petition, 'so as to give to the Roman Catholic priest a discretionary power of visiting the prison, would,' in your judgment, 'be fatal to all prison discipline, and lead to inconvenience, disturbance, and irregularity.'

"In justice to myself I feel bound to explain (1), that all I ask is the power of visiting those prisoners (being *bona fide* Roman Catholics) who do not happen to make a special request to see me, *under the same limitations* as I now visit those who do request to see me. And (2), that as all our ministrations are in aid of the prison discipline, and have for their object the moral reformation, as well as the religious instruction, of the prisoners, I fear that I may have failed to explain myself if I have created the impression of desiring anything which could by possibility lead to the disastrous consequences you anticipate as likely to result from a compliance with my wishes.

"In conclusion, I may be permitted to observe that, since it is unquestionable that a small proportion only of Roman Catholic prisoners at Pentonville receive the ministration of their own clergymen, while all the Roman Catholic prisoners alike are subjected without restriction to the visits of the Protestant chaplain of the prison, there would appear to be, in practice, a departure from the spirit, at least, of the rule, which allows all persons in public establishments not belonging to the Church of England to communicate, under proper regulations, with their own ministers.—I have the honour to be, with sincere respect, &c., yours,

"F. Oakeley."

This reply produced a final rejoinder from the Home Secretary, couched in the same courteous language as before, but leaving no hope of any present redress of the grievance.

"Whitehall, 25th May, 1858.

"Sir,—I am directed by Mr. Secretary Walpole to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 19th inst., offering further remarks in explanation of your request to be allowed to visit all prisoners in

Pentonville Prison who are registered as Roman Catholics, and whom the regulations of the prison restrict you from visiting, and I am to express to you his regret that he cannot, consistently with his duty, alter the carefully formed opinion which was communicated to you in my letter of the 8th instant.—I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

"H. WADDINGTON."

The limits of an official correspondence are necessarily inadequate to the full development of a case of this nature. We have thought, accordingly, that the present time, when the matter has been directly brought under the notice of official authorities, and when we believe it is in contemplation to take up the question in parliament, might offer a suitable opportunity for going into the subject at somewhat greater length, and drawing out the exact nature and operation of the disabilities under which Catholics labour, in our prisons generally, and especially at Pentonville, in regard of the free profession of their religion as well as the practice of its essential obligations. In whatever other respect our intended remarks may be deficient or faulty, we can at any rate guarantee to them the important condition of accuracy; for they are founded upon a personal experience ranging over a period of more than eight years, during which repeated attempts have been made under successive administrations to obtain a satisfactory settlement of the question to which they relate, whether by private memorials, motions in parliament, or representations made before a Committee of the House of Commons.

The state, then, of the case, is this. There are at Pentonville Prison, as a general rule, from seventy to one hundred Catholics. It is not necessary to state particularly the ground of this piece of statistics, but we pledge ourselves for its correctness. Even, however, if the average number were less, the question would not be materially affected; for its point is that there are many more Catholics in the prison than ever see the priest, and it makes no essential difference whether there be six times as many, or but four, or five times as many. The number, meanwhile, whom the priest is permitted to visit, even for their Easter duties, is between twelve and fifteen. The deficit consists of those who have not made personal application to see him. Such at least is the plea on which the authorities found

their refusal of leave to extend his visits to the remaining Catholic prisoners.

But why, it will be asked, do not all the prisoners prefer this request? Two reasons at least may be assigned. One reason may be that they do not know that they have the power of seeing their priest. When a man unhappily finds himself under the restraints of the law, his tendency is to overate the extent to which his liberty is abridged. Restraint has become his normal condition, as freedom is happily ours; and its effect is often to occasion such a depression of spirits and such a diminution of moral energy that a man has absolutely no heart for anything which involves an effort. He gets into the way of thinking that his only business is to take what is directly put before him, and do what his task-masters impose upon him. Difficulties, partly real, partly fanciful, seem continually to stand in the way of his taking the initiative in anything. If indeed he be a Protestant, this inertness is overcome by a strong counteracting influence. The chapel bell rings morning and evening for service. An officer goes round as the hour of morning and evening prayer approaches, and gives a reminder to the inmates of each cell by a signal at the door. Scarcely a day passes on which the House Chaplain does not pay his round of visits, distribute books, or enter into conversation with the men. But the poor Catholic, so far from having any corresponding advantages, is even included in the chaplain's list, and so far as he is reminded of religion at all, it is of religion in its heretical form. These arrangements fall in with his natural disposition to think that no religion is in any way or degree recognized in the establishment except the Protestant. Were he in a hospital, or even a workhouse, he would not have lost the instincts of freedom so far as to forbear from satisfying himself by inquiry of the real fact. But he is a prisoner, and looks for nothing better than "prison-fare," whether for the body or the soul.

The official answer to all this is, that the prison rules are read periodically to all the prisoners, and that by one of those rules every prisoner is allowed to see a minister of his own religion at his own request. But this answer is more specious than satisfactory. Every one knows how little impression is made upon the mind by such *routine* recitals. They are usually slurred over by the reader, while the hearer satisfies himself that he has done his duty

by assisting at the recital with his bodily presence, and giving it as much or as little attention as he pleases. The administrators of the prison discipline would never think for a moment of trusting to such admonitions as these for the enforcement of rules of which they really desired the observance. Such rules are not only read aloud to the prisoners, but everything which is possible is done in the daily discipline of the prison to impress them upon the minds of the prisoners and to secure obedience to them. *

But facts are better than arguments. And the fact is that the Catholic prisoners are not by any means universally aware that they can see their priest. We can vouch for it that they often remain for a length of time in ignorance of their privilege, and at last discover it perhaps by accident. The practice of the prison leads them to regard the chaplain of the establishment as their spiritual guide. He visits their cells regularly, engages them in religious conversation, and often, we are compelled in truth to add, introduces, or insinuates, objections to their religion. It is only the faith of the Irish which could withstand such a power, and even that faith, strong as it usually is, sometimes gives way under the pressure.

And is this, we ask, the mode in which a class of persons, who, by the hypothesis, are in a state of moral degradation, should be left to receive the benefits of religion, according to the only view of it which they can conscientiously receive, or which is calculated to be of the slightest advantage to them? Is the man whose appetite for what is needful to his soul's health has been blunted by a long course of crime, in just the condition not merely to be left without any external help towards seeking spiritual food, but to be hedged round with difficulties in the way of seeking it? When the appetite for our natural food has been impaired by fever, and requires "coaxing," what sort of a physician would he be who should shut up the kitchen, dismiss the cook, or (worse still) set before the squeamish patient, some kind of diet which would be distasteful to him in health and hunger, but is doubly so in the midst of illness and against the repugnance of nausea? If any truth be plain, it is, that the desire of religious help is apt to be in an inverse ratio to the need of it.

The following circumstance which we know to have

* See, on this subject, the Postcript at the end of the Article.

occurred, will serve to exhibit, in a striking manner, the mischief of restricting the ministerial visits of the priest to such prisoners only as express a wish for them. The visiting Catholic priest at Pentonville was one day accosted, on leaving the prison, by both the parents of one of the prisoners, who had just returned from seeing him. They were Irish; and with the most imploring accents and gestures, they besought the priest to go and see their son. The priest replied, that by the rules of the prison he could not visit a prisoner who had not asked to see him. "But our boy," was the answer, "never will ask for you. He is hardened by crime; but if you could gain access to him, you would, with the blessing of God, move him to repent." It seemed a case, if any, to warrant a departure from the rule. The urgent request of both parents, it might have been thought, would have satisfied every requirement. The prison authorities were applied to; they admitted the peculiarity of the case, but lamented their inability to make an exception. Application was then made to the Home Secretary, (Sir George Grey) who, it must be admitted, did all he could under the circumstances. But the rule prevailed. The young man was visited by the prison officers, and asked whether he wished to see the priest. As the parents predicted, he replied, No; whereupon the Home Secretary said that he had no further discretion. Who can say that, had this young man been freed from the *onus* of deciding the question for himself; that had it been proposed to him by one who would have pressed the suit, and reasoned with him, instead of being interrogated with official abruptness and brevity, he might not have been gradually won back to God?

It is evident from the correspondence we have quoted that Mr. Secretary Walpole either misunderstands the object with which our priests desire greater facilities of access to Catholic prisoners, or that he adopts in public the official view of the question. He perhaps thinks, or at any rate his language implies, that the motive of our priests is sectarian and controversial, for upon no other supposition is he justified in speaking of the tendency of their visits to a prison as turbulent and injurious to discipline. We can at any rate assure him, from personal knowledge, that a very different opinion is formed by those authorities on the spot, who have better means than anyone at a distance of knowing the actual effect of a priest's

influence. We can guarantee the assertion that, on more than one occasion, the visiting priest of Pentonville has been requested by the governor or his deputy to visit Catholic prisoners, as a last resource, when discipline had been tried with them in vain; and that the same authorities have afterwards expressed to the priest their sense of the value of his services in effecting a change for the better in the conduct of such prisoners. We know especially of one instance in which a prisoner who was pronounced incorrigible, who had inflicted grievous bodily injury upon the officers, set fire to his furniture, and exhibited other instances of confirmed depravity, was visited by the priest, *at the warden's request*, and was acknowledged to have derived the greatest benefit from the interview. Let not Mr. Walpole, therefore, or any other person, henceforth say that such visits could not be multiplied or facilitated without danger to prison discipline. What is the meaning of such an insinuation? Is it supposed that our priests desire access to prisoners, of our religion, with the view of leading them to set themselves up against the rules of the prison? The fact is eminently the reverse. The effect of such ministrations is to lead them to regard obedience as a duty, and to use their imprisonment as a time of repentance, and an opportunity of forming new and better habits. The lessons of patience, of contentment, of submission to the will of God, and to the system which, for the time being, forms their school of obedience, together with the inculcation of those habits, which can alone reconcile them to their terrible state of trial, and convert that state of solitude, which is a hell on earth to the irreligious, into a kind of monastic discipline; such is the object, and such is also, in the degree in which they are encouraged, the effect, of those ministrations which the Home Secretary ventures to characterize as the means of introducing into prisons an element of disturbance and an excuse for insubordination.

The separate, silent, and solitary method of prison discipline which is adopted at Pentonville, is the very field, of all others, for giving scope to the genius, and opportunity for the triumphs, of the Catholic ethical system. The provisions of the Catholic Church are just fitted to counteract its evils and obviate its risks. For it is universally felt to be, at least in its strictness, a failure; and even at Pentonville, its model arena, changes have proved inevitable.

The great *physical* evil which is found to be the result of this method in its unmodified form, is *insanity*. Cases of insanity, more or less developed, are frightfully common in prisons administered upon the solitary system. Relaxations have been introduced at Pentonville with the view of checking this evil. The prisoners are now more frequently visited than before, the doors of the cells are left open in the case of such as are well conducted, and other like arrangements have been introduced with the view of relieving these unhappy men from the fearful effects of mental vacuity. But dreadful to contemplate as are the sanitary dangers of solitude, those dangers are as nothing in the estimate of religion, when compared to its moral consequences, if unrelieved and uncorrected by the influences of religion. In a popular treatment of the subject, these of course can only be glanced at, but they may easily be imagined. What must be the thoughts of an undisciplined mind which has no food, or next to none, for the employment of its leisure time, but the retrospect of past crimes, and the miseries of present restraint? Too certain is it that the poet's picture—

> —— e'en in penance planning sins anew,

will be too commonly realized in such penitentiaries as these.

But a very real, and as we have reason for thinking, a very efficacious safeguard against all these dangers is furnished by the provisions of the Catholic Church. In the first place it is a well-known fact that in Catholic countries insanity is far rarer than in those in which Protestantism prevails; and even medical men have attributed the fact to the influence of the Confessional. Confession, therefore, is the institution of all others calculated to mitigate the physical evils of solitary confinement; and we have no doubt whatever that the statistics of Pentonville would exhibit a marked difference between the Catholic and Protestant prisoners in the matter of insanity. Indeed it is difficult to exaggerate the importance and the value of a provision which gives the inmates of such an establishment as Pentonville, the periodical opportunity of disburdening their hearts and consciences in the ear of one whom they look upon as a father and a friend. They well know that he has no object but their good; no interest to promote but their happiness in time and eternity; no master to serve

but their Lord and his own. They regard him, therefore, with none of that suspicion which leads them to mistrust the counsels of those who are directly connected with the establishment; they look upon him as the representative not of a discipline of punishment, but of a dispensation of mercy and forgiveness.

Nor is regular confession the only part of the Catholic rule which directly contributes to the ends of moral reformation as well as physical relief; and the moral reformation of the prisoners it is, if we are to believe the professions of our political men, which is the object of the actual arrangements. The habits of daily prayer, mental ejaculation, and, as far as it is possible, the exercise of meditation, are means of unequalled power towards relieving the mind, and instilling that spirit of submission and equanimity which is at once so desirable and so hard of attainment. And let not the suggestion of such practices, as helps to prison discipline, be treated by persons who have no experience in the matter, as visionary and unseasonable. Those who regard them in such a light have but a very insufficient idea of the religious capabilities of the class for whose benefit they are prepared. We speak advisedly when we say that the amount of good disposition and desire of improvement which prevails among the poor Catholics in our prisons, is far greater than can ever be imagined by those who are not familiar with this particular department of evangelical labour. The personal history of these unhappy men is in far the larger number of instances something like what follows. They are the children of Irish parents, and have been therefore religiously brought up. At the age of fifteen or sixteen they have come to England, where bad example, and the thoroughly irreligious atmosphere of our large towns, have done their worst in counteracting the influences of a Catholic home. They have fallen into wicked company, male and female, and perhaps have been led to commit a robbery, or at any rate come in for the consequences of mixing with others who have been caught in the act of crime. More commonly they are guilty; but possibly they are innocent, at least of the particular violation of law for which they have been convicted, though very probably they may have done what is worse. Anyhow they find themselves in prison, and it is perhaps the critical era of their lives. The very sight of the priest often wakes up in

their minds the memories of their home, and we need scarcely say how dear and how powerful are such memories to the Irish heart. The actual temptation to crime is removed, the atmosphere of the prison is at any rate favourable to tranquil thought; the monotony of the life gives zest to every change and interest to every occupation. A rosary or a crucifix (and we are glad to say that these are not interdicted at Pentonville,) is hailed as an unspeakable boon; and the priest, should he suggest a meditation on the Passion of our Lord, finds that his language is understood and his recommendation acceptable. We say confidently that there are prisoners at Pentonville who are living in a way which would shame, by the contrast, some Catholics outside it. Indeed, the visiting priest there can testify to the most unequivocal signs of interest in religion. The proofs of such interest are often quite touching. The prisoners are sometimes found cutting out little crosses in paper and hanging them on the walls of their cell. The two or three Catholic books which they are allowed, bear marks of being read with eagerness; and a rosary or an Agnus Dei is seized with the avidity with which a famished man would clutch a savoury morsel. All this being so, can anything, we ask, exceed the infatuation of those who think it a service to their country to keep the Catholic religion out of prisons, or to confine within the narrowest possible limits the amount of its service there? But it may be asked, to what practical end are our present remarks; what changes would satisfy the object we have in view, without anywise crossing the prison discipline which the Secretary of State cannot be more anxious to preserve than ourselves?

We answer at once, that every change which does not secure to the Catholics in our prisons, the full advantages of their religion, as well as entire freedom in the practice of it, must be accepted merely as an instalment. We will briefly point out what is the maximum, and what the minimum of our claims.

We ought not to acquiesce finally in anything less than the appointment of a resident Catholic chaplain with full powers, in every prison where the average number of Catholic prisoners exceeds fifty. Where it falls below, the chaplain need not perhaps be resident on the spot, but might be attached as a second or third priest to a mission in the neighbourhood. Any how, there should be daily

mass in the prison besides evening devotions once or twice a week, and of course regular times for confession and instruction, with the same facilities of access to the cells of the Catholic prisoners, as would be enjoyed by the Protestant chaplain in his intercourse with those of his own charge. For purposes of worship and instruction (whether preaching or school teaching) a room should be provided in the prison. The mode of appointing such chaplain must of course be a matter for the consideration of ecclesiastical authorities; with whom might safely be left the choice of priests fitted for a work of such peculiar difficulty and delicacy by the bent of their disposition and the nature of their experience. A competent salary should of course be provided from the same sources as those which supply the salary of the Protestant chaplain; and in consideration of this benefit, the secular authorities would be entitled to stipulate for an observance of the prison rules and discipline in all matters not essentially affecting the laws of the Church. Our own belief, founded on experience, is, that no practical difficulty would be found in the way of an arrangement between the ecclesiastical and secular powers by which the interests severally to be provided for might be adjusted. We have always found the local authorities ready aud disposed to assist in carrying out the objects of the Church to the full extent of the discretionary power residing in their hands.

But while we have thought it right to point out the goal to which should be finally directed the aims of all those who wish to see the spiritual interests of Catholics fully secured, we do not overlook the discouragements by which the prospect of any such consummation is unhappily clouded. We cannot forget that when, upon the earnest representation of the late Mr. Frederick Lucas, Lord Palmerston consented to include a small salary to the Catholic chaplains of the Government Prisons in the annual estimates, the item, after having passed one stage of legislation, was at length struck out, and its reinsertion never since attempted. We observe, too, that Mr. Secretary Walpole volunteers in his official letters an observation upon of the impossibility of providing a separate room for the worship and instruction of the Catholic prisoners at Pentonville, consistently with the regulations, which require the prisoners to be always separated from each other. As to the first requirement, that the Catholic Chaplain should

be put in all respects upon a level with the Protestant Chaplain, we think that the fact of Lord Palmerston having even entertained the question of salary, and sought to give effect to the recommendation, is a step in the direction of hope. We cannot believe it possible that as time advances, and liberal views gain ground, a proposition so reasonable in itself, and so conducive to the obvious interests of the community, will long remain in abeyance.

The obstacle raised by Mr. Walpole to the assembling of Catholic prisoners for religious purposes, though specious, is obviously not insurmountable. There are two modes of overcoming it. The one, which is the less practicable as well as the less eligible, is to convert the prison-chapel at certain hours into a place of Catholic worship. This has been allowed, we believe, in some of our military stations, and appears at any rate a less evil than the present entire want of provision for mass and instruction. The other mode of proceeding which, though it would require a stretch of liberality on the part of Government, would involve no conflict with conscientious scruples on any side, would be to build a room for the purpose.

Awaiting the time at which this full measure of justice shall be granted us, we should be well satisfied with a less perfect, if it were but understood to be a preliminary, arrangement. Waiving then, if waive we must, the question of a regular chaplain and a chapel for the accommodation of the Catholic prisoners, we should consider it a great improvement upon the actual state of things, could we get either a repeal of so much of the act (4 George IV. c. 63.) as appears to limit the visits of the Catholic priest to such prisoners only as desire them, or, (which would answer the same purpose) a recognized official interpretation of the offensive clause which would give an unfettered discretionary power to the executive. This was the object with which the Rev. F. Oakeley addressed the Home Secretary, and it will be observed that Mr. Walpole does not found his refusal upon the words of the Statute of George IV., but upon reasons of expediency,—a fact which certainly looks as if he did not wish to commit himself to the prohibitive construction of the statute. By whatever means the object may be attained, we really cannot understand by what valid reasons the refusal to grant it can be justified. We do not ask for more than the power of giving religious instruction to *bonâ fide* Catholics;

surely Government ought not to allow us less. There is no necessity for any law to compel the registration of prisoners on their admission, according to their religious profession. That is secured by the existing arrangements. All which is required is that the Visiting Priest should have access to the register, and that no obstacles should be put in the way of his seeing, under proper regulations, such persons as have declared themselves Catholics.

But there is another grave violation of the principles of religious liberty under the present system for which a remedy should be devised. While the *Catholic* priest is precluded from seeing more than a fraction of the whole number of Catholics at Pentonville, the Protestant chaplain has unlimited access to *Catholics* as well as Protestants. This anomaly might be met by a provision in an Act of Parliament (if Act be required) hindering any clergyman, not of the same religious profession, with a prisoner, from visiting him, except at the special request of such prisoner. The benefit of such a law would obviously be reciprocal.

We cannot but imagine that the objection to grant the priest freedom of access to his own people, is partly founded upon some such notion as we are going to put into words. "Were we to place no restrictions, it may be said, upon the intercourse of the priest with the Catholic prisoners, we must, in justice, allow equal facilities to Protestant ministers of every persuasion; and thus we should make the prison an arena of controversy, besides endangering the admission of undesirable teachers."

This again is a plausible argument which goes down in the House of Commons, and looks well in the newspapers, but it is really worth nothing. The *only* line of religious demarcation in these establishments, is between *Catholics and Protestants.* We never heard of the Protestants of different persuasions wishing to be visited each by his own minister. The separate position of the Established Church, in relation with Protestant sects, is a mere theory. Practically there is no such distinction, at least among the classes from which prisoners are taken. These classes have not religion enough to be particular. The prison chaplain is acceptable alike to all, so far as he is acceptable to any. Hence we repeat, that the question is between Catholic and Protestant, not between Church of England

and dissenters from her communion. Two chaplains only are practically required.

As long as such a state of things as we have described shall continue, it is vain to talk of "religious liberty" as carried out in England. We well know what would be said if Protestants were treated in Catholic countries as Catholics are treated at Pentonville. No sooner do Catholics find themselves within the gates of that establishment than they are surrounded with every inducement to forsake their religion. There is but one place of worship and that is Protestant; but one recognized resident minister of religion, and he too, is Protestant. It is true that Catholics are not absolutely compelled to attend the Protestant prayers, but difficulties stand in the way of their begging off. The very rules of the prison which impose silence and solitude during the greater part of the day, operate as a strong temptation to go any where, or do any thing, which breaks the tenour of this oppressive monotony. If the Catholic prisoners press for an exemption from attendance at the Protestant service, they will obtain it, but it is not granted them on the first, nor always on the second, occasion of asking for it. Often we believe, rather than teaze the authorities, they make up their minds to follow their companions to the chapel, intending when there to preserve at least a mental separation from the act of forbidden worship. But the visits of the Protestant chaplain they cannot escape, and the rule which prevents their seeing a priest unless they ask for him, practically tends to their being cut off altogether from religious opportunities; so that when the term of their imprisonment is over, they leave the prison neither Catholics nor Protestants, but practical infidels.

Yet Mr. Secretary Walpole, and he a conscientious and religiously-minded man, tells us that there can be no change! We can scarcely persuade ourselves that this is anything more than the language of official reserve. Lord Derby's Government has shown some disposition to respect our claims. The answer of General Peel to the deputation which requested his intervention in favour of our soldiers, was open, generous, and satisfactory. Heaven grant that it may be a harbinger of better days!* Lord

* We are delighted to add, that since the above was written, General Peel and the Government of which he is a member have given effect to that reply.

Derby has more well-wishers among Catholics than even he perhaps is aware of; and Catholics, possibly even Catholic priests, had something to do with the late unlooked-for rescue of his administration. The motive of their benevolence, or of their forbearance, is scarcely gratitude, for he has as yet done but little to deserve well of us; nor policy, for we have no sufficient guarantee for the future in the past. But Catholics have a sympathy with honesty and straightforwardness, even when employed to their detriment; they prefer open enemies to fickle and treacherous friends. If Lord Derby's Government has done as yet but little for us in the way of enabling us to preach the Gospel to the poor, Lord Palmerston's, with all its professions of liberality, did less. Even in this matter of the prisons, Mr. Secretary Walpole does but express in honest terms a conclusion which his predecessor in office practically carried out amidst a cloud of fair professions and a galaxy of splendid promises; and even the apparent inexorability of our present Home Secretary on the subject we have been treating, shall not provoke us to abandon the hope, which, though against hope, we have indulged, that a day of redress is approaching. The Protestant character of the present administration is far too well established to run the slightest risk of damage from a concession so small, and so obviously just, as that which the Home Secretary, though we trust but for a time, denies to our humble but earnest prayer. Our clergy do not make any point of receiving government pay, though, as they do government work, they have a right to it. The good things of this world they leave, without grudging and without envy, in the hands of a richly-endowed and state-protected establishment. All they ask, though more than they have yet received, is the free power of preparing for heaven the souls for which they are responsible, and they consider that such a claim ought not to be barred or prejudiced by the fact, that in training the subjects of the church for a higher state of being, we render them, even without directly aiming at such a result, fitter far to discharge their duties to their country, by educating them in humility, obedience, patience, contentment, and all those Christian virtues which are no less the safeguard of civil governments than the qualifications for our heavenly inheritance.

Postscript.—A portion of the foregoing argument is

founded upon the supposition that the rules of Pentonville Prison allow to prisoners, not of the Established Church, the power of being visited by a minister of their own.

While these pages have been passing through the press, we have ascertained, to our great surprise, and we will add, indignation, that *no such allowance is made in the rules of the prison in question.*

The rules of that prison do indeed exempt from necessary attendance at the prison chapel, those prisoners who declare themselves of a religion other than that of the Established Church, and make special request for such exemption. But as to the liberty of being visited by their own minister, the rules are entirely silent. We need hardly press upon our readers, the strength which this fact gives to our case.

ART. X.—*Christianity in China, Tartary, and Tibet.* By M. l'Abbé Huc. Vol. iii., 8vo. London: Longman, Brown, and Co. 1858.

THE early volumes of Père Huc's "History of Christianity in China" are still, we doubt not, fresh in the memory of many of our readers. The second volume* closes at the period of the Tartar conquest, or rather at the death of Chun-Tche, the first emperor of the new dynasty of China.

During the long internal struggle which terminated in the triumph of the foreign conquerors, the Christian missionaries had endeavoured to maintain a strict neutrality, and had avoided as far as was possible all identification with either of the conflicting interests. But, on the peaceable establishment of the authority of Chun-Tche they had not hesitated to recognize him; and, by the valuable assistance which the scientific and mechanical accomplishments of many of their number, and especially of Father Adam

---

* See ante vol. xlii. pp. 438-80.

Schall, enabled them to render to the court, they succeeded in securing the protection and even the marked favour of the emperor and his leading ministers. Upon his death, as the son whom he had designated as his successor was yet a boy, only eight years old, a regency was appointed. Historians have not failed to observe the coincidence of this condition of the greatest empire of the east with that of the great western monarchy of France at the same period, and this coincidence is especially notable in the manner in which both the young monarchs emancipated themselves from the control of their ministers, and assumed the full and unreserved personal exercise of their royal prerogatives. The well-known saying of Lewis XIV. on the death of Mazarin, is but an echo of the words of the young Khang-Hi when, on learning the death of Souy, the First Regent, he called the Council of Regency, the supreme courts, and the grand dignitaries of the empire, "and after a moment of profound and solemn silence, declared that the Council of Regency existed no longer, and that from that moment he would himself assume the reins of government."

This regency, nevertheless, was a period of much difficulty and suffering for the infant Church of China. The regents, following the traditionary policy of almost all such bodies, reversed in many particulars the system pursued by the late emperor, and displaced from office those who had been especially favoured by him. The Christian favourites of Chun-Tche were of course doubly obnoxious. For a time they were obliged to dissemble; and they even seemed "still to bear in mind the services rendered by Father Schall, and the attachment the late emperor had felt to him. They had even the good taste to confer on him solemnly the title of *Preceptor of the young Prince* who was called to govern the empire. But though nothing appeared to be changed, it was felt by the missionaries that the atmosphere was charged, and that ere long the tempest would burst forth."

Soon afterwards, notwithstanding, the illness of Father Schall, who was seized with paralysis, afforded an occasion of alleging a series of charges against him, and against the Christian religion, which supplied a ground for the preconcerted measures of repression and persecution, on which the Regents had resolved. The charges were made by an astronomer named Yang-Kouang-Sien, who,

as if to make the downfall of the Christians more signal, was appointed to the place which Father Schall had previously held, at the head of the Board of Mathematics and Celestial literature.

"This persecution was not confined within the limits of the capital. The viceroys of all the provinces of the empire received orders to seize on all the preachers of the Gospel, and have them taken to Pekin, to be judged there. The Tribunal of Crimes was directed to subject them to the most rigorous examination, and to determine, conjointly with the Tribunal of Rites, upon the punishment to be inflicted on them. The missionaries in all parts of the empire were then immediately arrested, loaded with chains, and thrown into dungeons, while the satellites of the mandarins seized on their houses, sacked them from top to bottom, burnt their books, their sacred ornaments, and everything that bore a vestige of a religious purpose.

"The tribunals of Pekin were occupied for a long time with their trials, and that of Father Adam Schall, who was regarded as chief and doctor of the Christian law, was conducted with particular formality. It was a touching spectacle to see this venerable man at seventy-five years of age—he who had once been the friend of the Emperor, and the oracle of the court—now kneeling before his judges like a common criminal, sinking under the pressure of infirmity as well as of age, and unable to utter a single word in his own justification.

"Father Verbiest undertook his defence, and endeavoured to draw the storm upon his own head, instead of that of Schall. He spoke in so generous and noble a strain that the audience could not help applauding him, and his heroic charity would have triumphed, and the slanderers been put to confusion, if the resolution had not been taken beforehand to exterminate Christianity. But the missionaries were ordered back to prison, each with nine heavy chains upon him, and guarded by ten satellites. Perpetually surrounded by a vile soldiery, who heaped insults upon them—compelled by the weight of their fetters to remain always in a stooping position, and shut up in foul unclean dungeons, their sufferings were terrible.

"They were sometimes taken from them, but it was to be carried before the Tribunal of Rites in the midst of a terrific display, and it was on one of those occasions that the Dominican Father Coronatus met Schall and Verbiest at the entrance of the judgment-hall; and he prostrated himself at the feet of the Jesuits, and kissed the fetters which they wore so worthily for the name of Christ. At length, on the 16th of January, 1665, the missionaries were found guilty, and the Christian religion, as false and pernicious, was proscribed throughout the empire."—vol. iii. pp. 32-34.

Such was the sentence of the Tribunal of Rites. But

it rested with the Tribunal of Crimes to determine the nature and the degree of the punishment. The Missionaries were accordingly taken to this last tribunal, and then the interrogatories were re-commenced, accompanied, as usual, by horrible ill-treatment of the prisoners. Father Schall was always the chief object of hatred; but though, as we have said, speechless from paralysis, Providence had given him an eloquent advocate in his companion in captivity, Father Verbiest, and now again he was heard demonstrating the sanctity of the Christian religion to the mournful accompaniment of the rattling of his chains.

The Tribunal of Crimes had probably seldom listened to such pathetic, courageous, and self-denying eloquence; but the judges were too malignant, and too much under the dominion of passion, to allow themselves to be convinced. On the 15th of April, 1665, the missionaries were condemned to be scourged with rods, and then exiled to the remotest wilds of Tartary—all except Adam Schall, who, as chief of the sect that preached rebellion, was condemned to be strangled. This punishment, however, was afterwards thought too light, and the court assembled again to consider it, and then ordered that he should be "cut in a thousand pieces"—regarded as the most degrading as well as the most cruel punishment that can be inflicted.

"The body of the condemned," says Pere Huc, "is cut to pieces, beginning with the extremities, and after every amputation, the flow of blood is stopped with quicklime or red-hot irons."

However, before this sentence was confirmed by the Regents, a fearful earthquake which shook the whole city, so terrified the population and the Regents themselves, that they did not dare to ratify the order for its execution. On the contrary, by the ancient usage of China, it is ordered that the government in such circumstances of public alarm, should endeavour by some signal act of clemency, to avert the anger of heaven indicated by these manifestations; and the Regents, much, it may be presumed against their will, resolved to throw open their prisons and release the Christian captives who had been condemned to death. Father Schall, however, was excepted from this indulgence. But most fortunately for him, his sentence was, in the first instance, submitted to the Empress Mother for approval, and she instead of

approving, "expressed the utmost indignation at it—threw it on the ground, trampled it under foot, and demanded of the Regents whether they had already forgotten the esteem and regard her son had had for a man whom they ought to have treated with respect, instead of punishing as a criminal."

The respite, however, came too late. His powers, already worn out by age, sunk under the rigours of his imprisonment, and he died within a year afterwards.

It was in the following year that the young emperor, as already described, took the government into his own hands; and very soon after his accession, an incident occurred similar to those which first led to the establishment of the Jesuits in court favour at Pekin. Under the Presidency of the astronomer, who, by his false charges, had displaced Father Schall, the great national work of the compilation of the calendar had fallen into gross disorder; and the opinion of Yang Kouang-Sien's incompetency had gradually become universal. The young Emperor became aware of these imputations, and on inquiry ascertained that the skill of the Europeans, in these matters, far exceeded that of the native mathematician. He learned too, that, although many of the former had been exiled during his minority, several still remained in China. He resolved therefore to address himself to Father Verbiest, who was the head of the mission, since the death of the venerable martyr Adam Schall. Verbiest boldly declared that the calendar, as completed by Yang-Kouang-Sien, was full of inaccuracies. The result was a personal interview with the Emperor in the presence of the entire court, in which Father Verbiest proposed to put the question between the rival astronomies to the test of actual experiment. On the emperor's approving the proposal, Yang-Kouang-Sien at first put on an appearance of bold confidence, and declared his readiness to undergo the trial; but accompanied his acceptance of the challenge with an invective against the Christian religion so violent and unmeasured, that the emperor himself called him to account, and insisted that the case should be tried purely on its own scientific merits. It is hardly necessary to say that the Jesuit Father had a complete triumph; and that the failure of Yang-Kouang-Sien led to the usual result of failure in a barbarous court—his disgrace and exile. A still more important result was the rescinding of the san-

guinary edict against Christianity which had been issued by the Regents. Father Verbiest was appointed to the Presidency of the Board of Mathematics, and at once resolved boldly to establish his supremacy by a very desisive step,—no less than the retrenchment of the intercalary month, which, by Chinese usage, was to be introduced in the first calendar which it fell to his lot to prepare. The emperor assented to his proposal; and he was not slow to turn the concession to the advantage of his brethren and of the Christian cause.

"The astonishment that prevailed throughout the Empire, as well as among the neighbouring nations, when it became known that a certain Nan-Hoai-Jen, a barbarian from the remotest West, had been allowed to cut a month out of the Calendar, it is difficult to describe; but from that time the reputation of Europeans in China rose considerably, and the Christians were able at length to look forward to a termination of their sufferings.

"Father Verbiest availed himself of the confidence placed in him by the Emperor to obtain the permission for the return of the missionaries exiled to Canton, and the free exercise of their religion throughout the empire. An opportunity for this was readily found, as the Emperor, desiring to annul the decrees of his guardians, the Regents, had published an edict, desiring all who had suffered any wrong during his minority to have recourse to him; and Father Verbiest immediately presented a memorial, in which he complained that by an act of flagrant injustice, the Regent, abusing his authority, had proscribed the law of the true God, and banished from the empire those who preached it. This petition was at first rejected by the tribunal charged with the examination of it, but Father Verbiest did not allow himself to be discouraged; he demanded other judges, and the Emperor condescended to grant his request, and brought the affair before a general assembly of Grand Mandarins, who took seven whole days to deliberate upon it, after which they came to a decision that the Christian law had been unjustly condemned, and contained nothing contrary to the welfare of the state, or the duties of its subjects. The exiled missionaries were then recalled, and permission given them to return to their churches and exercise their ministerial functions; the Christian mandarins, who had been dismissed from various posts, were publicly restored to them, and the *amende honorable* made to the memory of Father Adam Schall. His titles were restored, his ancestors ennobled, and the Emperor allotted a considerable sum to build for him a superb mausoleum, ornamented with marble statues, and symbolical figures, according to the custom of the country. This fine mausoleum, which was worthy of the great Emperor at whose expense it was erected, as well as of the illus-

trious missionary it was intended to honour, was still to be seen in the environs of Pekin, in the year 1850, when we ourselves saw it there."—vol. iii. pp. 63-64.

This edict, by a curious coincidence, had a clause similar to that which was inserted in the first edict which gave toleration to Christianity in the Roman Empire. While it gave freedom to those who had already conformed to the Christian religion, it prohibited the native Chinese under severe penalties from embracing Christianity for the future; but as the prohibition was by no means strictly enforced, Father Verbiest's companions were content to wait a more favourable time, and in the meantime to turn to the best account the opportunities which they already enjoyed. "They had no sooner returned to their former abodes, than they not only set about repairing the losses occasioned by the persecution, but founded many new establishments; in this one year, notwithstanding the prohibition, more than twenty thousand new converts received baptism; and amongst these courageous and fervent neophytes were to be counted the maternal uncle of the Emperor, and the Generalissimo of the Tartar forces."

The influence which Father Verbiest acquired with the young emperor, was hardly less than that of Adam Schall at the court of his predecessor. For more than five months he devoted almost the entire day to the instruction of his imperial pupil in mathematics and astronomy. "I used," says Father Verbiest, "to go to the palace at break of day, and did not quit it till three or four in the afternoon; and during this time I remained alone with the Emperor reading and explaining. Very often he would keep me to dinner, and entertain me with most dainty dishes, served on gold plate. To appreciate fully these marks of friendship shown me by the Emperor, a European must remember that in China the sovereign is revered as a divinity, and is scarcely seen by any one, especially not by foreigners. Those who come from the most distant courts, as ambassadors, consider themselves fortunate if they are admitted but once to a private audience, and even then the Emperor is only seen by them at a considerable distance, from a neighbouring apartment. The ministers, and even his nearest relations, appear before him in silence, and with manifestations of the most profound respect, and

when they have occasion to speak to him they always kneel."

But the crowning stroke by which he established his ascendancy at court, was his success in casting light pieces of field artillery for the use of the emperor's army in a war which he undertook for the purpose of repressing a formidable insurrectionary reaction in favour of the Ming dynasty, in which all the disaffected of the old national parties united soon after his accession. The reader may recollect a similar service rendered to the Emperor Chun-Tche, by Father Schall; but the pieces prepared by him were too heavy for field use, especially in the mountain warfare in which the young emperor was now engaged; and Father Verbiest added to the equipment a set of new pieces, of small calibre, but of very considerable range and of great accuracy, which rendered such service in the campaign, that at its close he received orders to construct three hundred and twenty cannon of all dimensions for the various fortresses throughout the empire. The difficulties which he had to contend with are amusingly described. The greatest of them were raised by "the eunuchs of the palace. These persons, who are jealous to excess, could not endure to see a foreigner so high in the good graces of their sovereign; and they made all kinds of attempts to hinder the success of the work. They complained continually of the slowness of the workmen; they manœuvred to get the metal stolen by the lower officers of the court; and when one of the large pieces was nearly finished they contrived to force an iron ball into it, under the idea that they would thus render it useless. But Father Verbiest had it loaded through the touchhole, and fired it off, and the ball issuing from it with a loud report, convinced the disconcerted eunuchs that their malice was no match for the learning of the missionary."

It is a curious illustration, nevertheless, of the dependence upon subordinate officials, in which even the most absolute monarchs are sometimes placed, that these gracious intentions of the emperor were resisted, and for a time defeated, by the machinations of some of the enemies of the Christians in the lower ranks of office. Thwarted in various ways by the hostile intrigues of their interested rivals, and baffled by the adverse decisions of courts of justice, acting under the protection of the letter of law,

they at last brought the matter to a crisis by presenting a memorial which the emperor referred to the Court of Rites; on which that tribunal, notwithstanding its reluctance to gainsay the will of the emperor, pronounced an adverse decision. The emperor sent it back to them for reconsideration. In vain. They re-asserted their judgment, and in the end the emperor was most reluctantly compelled to confirm it. The good fathers, however, did not even yet despair. They had a firm friend in Prince Sosan, one of the most influential of the emperor's advisers, and still more in the emperor's own love of science and respect for its professors; and at last they obtained, even from the hostile Court of Rites itself, an edict not only granting complete toleration for the practice of Christianity by those who had already embraced it; but free permission for all to study and to adopt its doctrines according to the dictates of their conscience.

The indulgence thus accorded was followed out at a later period of Khang-Hi's reign by positive acts of patronage and favour. When the French Jesuits, who were subsequently established at Pekin, presented a petition, praying to be permitted to build a church on a scale suitable to the dignity of Christian worship, he "sent the first eunuch to receive their petition, and reply to it that, since building a church was certainly a holy work, he would contribute to it, by way of marking his esteem both for their religion and themselves. He then ordered that an ingot of silver of fifty ounces, and two pieces of silk, should be given to each of the missionaries, in order, he said, that they might themselves make the offering to their new church. The emperor also furnished a part of the materials, and appointed mandarins to preside over the work."

This decisive step produced a most beneficial influence. The erection of such a church at "Pekin made a great sensation throughout China; nothing had been spared to excite the curiosity of the Chinese, or to attract the mandarins and persons of distinction from all parts of the empire, in order that opportunities might be obtained of speaking to them of God and instructing them in the mysteries of Christianity. The Prince Heir Apparent, the two brothers of the Emperor, the princes their children, and the principal persons of the court, hastened to visit the church. The provincial magistrates and the

literati, who come annually to Pekin to undergo examination for their diplomas of doctorate, were similarly attracted, and never failed to come and see the new church, drawing thence apparently sentiments favourable to the Christian religion."

But more extraordinary still is it to find the emperor publicly identifying himself with the work, and even supplying with his own hand the inscriptions which were set up in the church.

"High over the entrance were engraved the words:—'Temple of the Lord of Heaven, built by order of the Emperor;' and beneath this inscription were three others, written and presented by the Emperor himself. The one in front, a little below the above, was in letters of gold, ten feet high, and signified:—'To the true Principle of all things.' The two others, in letters a foot long, were placed over the two columns of the peristyle: on the right you read—

"'He is infinitely good and infinitely just; He enlightens, He sustains, He rules all with supreme authority and sovereign justice.'

"On the left were the following words—

"'He has had no beginning, He will have no end. He has produced all things from the beginning, it is He who governs them, and is their true Lord.'

"'Whoever is interested in the glory of his country,' says Chateaubriand, 'cannot see without emotion these poor French missionaries giving such ideas of God as this to the chief of millions of men. What a noble use to make of religion!'"—vol. iii. pp. 225-26.

Unhappily, however, these prospects, for a time so consolatory, were marred by divisions among the missionaries themselves, and especially by the celebrated controversy on the so-called "Chinese ceremonies." Pere Huc's account of this interesting controversy with which the fortune, or at least the external status, of Christianity in China, is inseparably connected in history, is so admirable, that we shall make an apology for extracting so much of it, as will enable the reader to understand the controversy itself, and to follow the main outlines of its history.

From the very first a question had arisen among the missionaries themselves, as to the permissibility among the converted Chinese of certain practices which were universal in the Chinese nation, and which appeared to savour so strongly of the pagan superstition, as to be hardly com-

patible with the profession of Christianity. The main body of the missionaries, however, had come to the conclusion that these practices, however they might of their own nature form little of the religious character, were susceptible of a purely civil or social construction; and that, if accompanied by a disclaimer of the religious signification, might be permitted, for grave reasons, to those of the new converts whose social or civil position appeared to require that they should conform to them. This decision, although not universally approved in the Order, was commonly followed by the Jesuit Fathers in China, in their dealings with the neophytes whom they received into the Church.

The views entertained by the missionaries of the other Orders which after a time were introduced into China, differed widely from those of the present Fathers. The controversy may be said to have begun in reality under Father Morales, a Spanish Dominican, who had been attached to the mission of the Philippine Islands.

"It was, in fact, in 1633, that the Dominican, Jean-Baptiste Morales, and the Franciscan, Antoine de Sainte Marie, made their way from Manilla into the province of Fo-kien. As they had, during their long stay in the Philippine Islands, familiarized themselves with the Chinese language, they were able, from the moment of their arrival in China, to commence preaching; and the dissensions that had occurred among the Jesuits on the subject of the Chinese rites immediately attracted their attention.

"Father Morales investigated the points of controversy on the spot, and amongst the neophytes, and even interrogated many of the literary class who had been converted by the Jesuits; and all affirmed, under oath, that the sacrifices offered to Confucius and the ancestors were offered with a view of rendering them propitious. From that moment the Dominicans saw in these rites only highly reprehensible superstitions, and loudly protested against the conduct pursued with regard to them by the majority of the Jesuits. They also wrote to Rome, to inform the Sovereign Pontiff of the danger to which the purity of the faith was exposed in the missions of China; while the Jesuits, on their part, sent a very different statement of the question, taken from an opposite point of view.

"In the meantime a violent persecution arose in the province of Fo-kien, and the missionary establishments of the Dominican Fathers were destroyed. Morales, who would not allow Christian converts to join in the sacrifices in honour of Confucius and the ancestors, saw himself an object of hatred both to the mandarins and the people, and was obliged to conceal himself. He then

wandered for days together about the mountains, and along the banks of rivers, without any other food than roots and wild herbs, but was at last seized and thrown into prison, afterwards put in the *Cangue*, and beaten with rods, and then put on board a vessel to be taken to Macao, with a prohibition against ever re-entering the Empire of China. In the leisure of his involuntary seclusion, he studied more profoundly the important questions which divided the missionaries of China; and the Superiors of the Friars Minor and of the Preachers took the resolution of sending him to Rome, on a mission connected with this controversy.

"Morales reached the capital of the Christian world in 1643, and laid before the court of Rome seventeen questions, which were decided in favour of the Friars Minor, by a decree of Innocent 10th (dated Sept. 12, 1645), and which Morales himself notified to the Vice-Provincial of the Jesuits of China. In adding to this decree the clause, '*until it shall be decided otherwise*,' Innocent 10th had himself implied that it might be revocable, under the supposition of a more accurate statement of the facts; and the Jesuits therefore deputed Father Martini to go as their envoy to Rome, and explain the reasons upon which they had acted in the toleration they had thought it advisable to extend to ceremonies which they regarded as purely civil, and not religious in their character.

"Considered from this point of view, these ceremonies could not be thought to merit the condemnation pronounced against them on the statements of the Dominican Morales, and a decree of Alexander 7th (bearing date March 23, 1656), and framed on the statement made by the Jesuit Martini, declared that, assuming the correctness of this statement, the ceremonies in question were lawful, and might be conscientiously tolerated, especially if, previous to participating in them, the Christian should enter a protest against any tendency to idolatrous superstition to be found in them. Since the memorials drawn up by the Dominican and the Jesuit differed entirely from each other, the answers of the Pope might also differ, without any contradiction."—vol. iii. pp. 10-12.

It was a strong argument in favour of the Jesuits in this conflict that the celebrated native Chinese bishop, Gregory Lopez, whose authority on a question of purely national usage seemed especially deserving of weight, was decidedly upon their side of the question.

"On this occasion the Bishop-elect of Basilea sent forth a little work in twenty pages, written in Chinese on this very subject, of the controversy that divided the Christian missionaries of China; and in this he candidly confesses, 1st, that the literati of China are atheists; 2nd, that in the spring and autumn it is customary to offer to Confucius a hog, a goat, wine, fruits, and silk stuffs; that the governors of towns are bound to present themselves before his

tablet twice a month, and the mandarins whenever they go to take possession of an office, when they have to offer perfumes and wax lights. Further, that the animals offered are required to be carefully selected, and the people have to prepare themselves for the ceremony by fasting, &c. That for such occasions retreat and separation from worldly affairs are recommended (as well as baths and purifications), in order that they may be fit to communicate with the spirits on the day of the ceremony. The author adds that the Chinese offer the blood and hair of animals, and that, as a necessary condition to the sacrifice, they announce to the spirits of the defunct what they are about to do. The prelate acknowledges that the Chinese keep in their houses the tablets of their ancestors, that they visit them every day, make profound salutations to them, and render them an account of their affairs; that when a child is born to them, or that they intend to marry one of their daughters, they give notice to that effect to their deceased relatives, and that they serve meats before their tablets on the first and fifth day of the moon. Finally, Lopez does not deny that they offer prayers and return thanks to the spirits, in order that they may procure them what is good, and turn from them all kinds of evil.

"In this pamphlet Gregory Lopez divides the Chinese into three classes. First, those of the literati of the highest order; secondly, those of inferior attainments, including ordinary functionaries and citizens; thirdly, that of the illiterate populace. Lopez affirms that the more enlightened of these classes do not generally admit the errors which are mingled with the ceremonies in honour of ancestors, nor the presence of the souls of the dead in the tablets, but that others adopt them; all are persuaded that their different ancestors have more power than they had during their lives, that they exercise influence for good or evil over the fortunes of their descendants, and that they enjoy the offerings presented to them.

"He adds that this faith has been established for two thousand years, and that the commentators have explained the text of the classic books in this sense, although it is by no means clear that that is really the meaning of the passage cited. The literary men of the second class are said to be similarly divided in their opinions, but that among the third these errors prevail almost without exception.

"The Bishop of Basilea could not be ignorant of the ceremonies in use among his countrymen, and it may well be supposed that he was better informed of the facts concerning this question than any other of the missionaries; but he had never been a skilful theologian, and after having spoken thus of the offerings made to Confucius, and the manner in which people prepared themselves for the ceremony, he merely adds, 'All this appears at first to exceed the limits of merely civil honours, and approach the confines of super-

stition.' The most learned of the Dominicans, whom a long practice of ministerial functions in China had also made fully acquainted with all that related to the manners and customs of the people, thought and spoke quite differently upon this point."—vol. iii. pp. 139-141.

The question remained in the same unsettled condition till very near the end of the seventeenth century. The saving clause inserted in the condemnation of the ceremonies, and the partially permissive decree of Alexander VII., were used by the priests as a ground of justification for the toleration which they still continued to extend to some of them; and although the congregation of the Holy Office, by successive declarations in 1669 and 1674, decided that these decrees could not lawfully be construed into a justification of the proceedings adopted by the Jesuits, the contrary practice continued to be followed in almost all the missions of the order in China. But a crisis came at last.

"The permission granted to each party to draw up memorials and statements according to their own views, only kept the spirit of contention alive, as Innocent XI. perceived, and he attempted to find a remedy for an evil that was becoming highly injurious to the success of the missions. He endeavoured to obtain in China itself information certain and extensive enough to place Rome in a position to give an absolute decision; a wise resolution, and, indeed, one that circumstances necessitated. We have already said that there had been formed at Paris a society of ecclesiastics whose purpose was to carry the knowledge of the Gospel to nations still plunged in the darkness of infidelity and idolatry. Louis XIV., whose munificence was always enlightened, had assisted in its establishment, and it had taken the name of Seminary of Foreign Missions. From the earliest period of its institution it had included men of rare virtue and merit, and of truly apostolic zeal. Towards the epoch at which the dispute concerning Chinese ceremonies was at its greatest height, several of these fervent missionaries had made their way into China and joined the evangelical labourers of that empire; but as they were not formally associated either with Jesuits or Dominicans, they were able to study in perfect freedom this question of the rites, and judge of it without any bias from *esprit de corps*. They afterwards took the side of those who considered the Chinese worship of ancestors inconsistent with the principles of Christianity. One of them, M. Maigrot, Doctor of the Sorbonne, and Vicar-Apostolic of Fo-Kien, with the title of Bishop of Conon, was commissioned by the Popes Innocent XI. and Innocent XII. to examine on the spot the true state of the contro-

versy, and to inform the Holy See of the conclusion they should come to.

"After having employed the time he thought sufficient in this important examination, he published a mandate, by which he condemned the rites practised in honour of Confucius and the ancestors. 'We declare,' he said, 'that the allegations made to Pope Alexander VII. on the controverted points which divide the evangelical labourers of this mission, are, in many respects, inaccurate, and that therefore the missionaries cannot be guided only by the answers that the Holy See has made, although those answers are true and wise with relation to the circumstances stated.' He concluded in these words:—'Finally, we declare that we do not intend by this present declaration and mandate to blame those who have thought otherwise, or followed a practice different from that which we order to be followed in future. In fact, in a matter of this kind, it need not appear astonishing that all the missionaries have not been of the same opinion, but that each one should have followed what appeared to him, before God, most conformable to the truth.

"'We will not assert that there are in China missionaries who have fallen into gross idolatry, or suffered others so to fall; we could not make that assertion without gross calumny; but they have permitted certain ceremonies, which they regarded as purely civil, but which, according to many others, are superstitious and idolatrous.'

"This mandate, although drawn up in a rather conciliatory spirit, still did but fan the flames of controversy. The missionaries persisted in opposing the decree of Alexander VII. and that of Innocent XI. to the decision of the Bishop of Conon; they asserted that the mandate had been hastily drawn up, in accordance with a false statement, and they complained of this in the memorials they sent to Rome. On his side the prelate presented in 1696 a petition to the papal court, praying that it would come to some decision concerning his mandate. The Pope was, however, now determined not to give judgment on the simple declaration of either of the parties, but to procure data that should be independent of both, before coming to a final conclusion."—vol. iii. pp. 240 3.

The affair, too, was most seriously complicated by a step taken by the Jesuit fathers, with the view of obtaining an authoritative decision as to the light in which these ceremonies were regarded by the Chinese nation itself. They committed what Pere Huc calls "the signal imprudence" of requesting from the emperor his own opinion on the controversy. "We, your faithful subjects," they wrote, "though born in distant countries, respectfully entreat your majesty to give us positive instructions on the following

points:—The literary men of Europe have been informed that certain ceremonies are practised in China in honour of Confucius; that sacrifices to heaven are offered in them, and particular rites observed with regard to ancestors; persuaded that these ceremonies and these rites are founded in reason, the European Literati, who do not nevertheless know the true meaning of them, beg you most earnestly to make them acquainted with it.

"'We have always supposed, that Confucius was honoured in China as a legislator; and that it was in this point of view only that the ceremonies established in his honour were practised. We believe, that the rites observed with respect to ancestors are only established with a view of making known the affection that has been felt for them, and consecrating the memory of the good they have done during their lives. As for the sacrifice to heaven (Tien), we believe that it is not to the visible heaven, the sky above us, they are offered, but to the Supreme Master, Author, and Preserver of Heaven and Earth, and all that they contain. Such is the sense and interpretation we have always given to these Chinese ceremonies; but as foreigners cannot be supposed to be able to pronounce on this important point, with the same certainty as the Chinese themselves, we beseech your majesty not to refuse us the explanation which we need, and which, with respect and submission, we await.'

"'The emperor,' continue the Annals, 'read this petition with much attention, and signified his approval of it, as perfectly conformable to the religious doctrine of the Chinese.'"—pp. 243-4.

To add to the difficulty created by this consultation of the emperor, his reply was kept secret. Meanwhile, however, the decision adverse to the Jesuit practice had been rendered at Rome.

"The inquiry into this difficult and dangerous matter was, however, carried on at Rome in a circumspect and deliberate manner; but, at length, after having listened to the arguments of both parties, to each of whom was allowed the most ample freedom to defend itself, the 'Congregation of the Holy Office' passed a sentence of rigid prohibition against the Chinese ceremonies, as well as of the terms which the Chinese Literati made use of to designate God; and in 1704, Clement XI. approved this decision by a solemn decree, but ordered it to be promulgated only by Maillard de Tournon, Patriarch of Antioch, about to be sent to China as Legate

Apostolic. The Congregation of the Holy Office had added to the decree, 'The Patriarch of Antioch must be charged on the one hand to sweep away, in the words of Tertullian, even the lightest vapour of pagan superstition, but at the same time to defend the honour and reputation of those evangelical labourers who have toiled so assiduously in the vineyard of the Lord; and who, before the above-mentioned questions were decided by the prudence and integrity of the Holy See, were of a different opinion. They must not be made to pass for abettors of idolatry, especially as they have declared that they never permitted the greater part of the things that have been laid to their charge—which ought never to be permitted to Christians; and because, moreover, there can be no doubt that now, when the matter is irrevocably decided, they will submit with due humility and obedience to the decision and commands of the Holy See.'"—vol. iii. pp. 247-48.

Mgr. Maillard de Tournon, on his arrival, was received with much ceremony by the emperor; but it was clear from the beginning that his mission would be unsuccessful.

"On the 31st of December, 1705, the Patriarch of Antioch was admitted for the first time to the presence of Khang-Hi. He was followed by all the missionaries of Pekin, and his presentation took place with unaccustomed pomp. The different cohorts through which he passed in traversing the imperial palace, had orders to dispense with the customary Chinese ceremonies, in consideration of his feeble state of health. The Emperor made him sit down on a rich divan, and himself presented him a cup of wine, and afterwards had a banquet served to him on thirty-six golden dishes. After this state feast, the conversation ran for a long time on unimportant subjects, and matters of mere curiosity; but at length the Emperor requested the Patriarch to explain himself concerning his legation. The Prelate, hoping that he would object less to admitting a Nuncio than a Superior-General, proposed on the part of the Pope to establish at Pekin an agent, charged with maintaining the relations between Europe and China; and the monarch replied, that that would be quite easy, and the commission might be given to some one of the old European residents of his palace. The Legate, seeing in this proposal the same influence and the same inconvenience as before, replied that it would be more proper to appoint a new agent, but the Emperor remained immoveable, and refused to accept a new man. In this instance, it must be confessed, there seems reason to suspect the influence of the missionaries, who were living at the court, and who felt convinced that the presence of a Superior General not of their Society would be fatal to the missions.

"The same influence was again perceptible when another subject came to be discussed in the same interview. The Emperor wished

to send some presents to the Sovereign Pontiff, in return for those he had received, and to ask at the same time that there might be sent to his court twelve persons of learning and accomplishments—namely, three mathematicians, three physicians, three surgeons, and three musicians; and the Patriarch willingly undertook to forward the presents to Rome, and to negotiate for the despatch of the twelve new missionaries. He wished, however, naturally enough, to entrust an affair of this importance to some one of whose devotion and fidelity he was well assured, but Khang-Hi did not approve of the Patriarch's choice, and pointed out Father Bouvet to fill the office, although it certainly could not have been supposed that he possessed the entire confidence of the Legate Apostolic. It was in vain, however, that he made representations to this effect; he was obliged to submit to this new check, and to bow before the imperial will, which remained inflexible."—vol. iii. p. 251-52.

One important result of De Tournon's mission, however, was a full and formal report on the nature of the ceremonies, which Père Huc has carefully condensed. We shall extract it at full length.

"The Chinese, especially those of the literary class—the principal one in the empire, and of which the sovereign himself is the head—pay especial homage to deceased parents and ancestors to the fourth degree, and that both in public and private. They have temples, chapels, and oratories dedicated to them, in which are tablets of chestnut wood inscribed with large characters—'Throne (or seat) of the soul or spirit' of such or such a one, with the name and title of the person in question. In the midst of the edifice is a table or altar, with other smaller ones on each side, above which are placed the tablets of various ancestors.

"Three or four times a year, and especially in spring and autumn, a solemn oblation or sacrifice is celebrated with great pomp in these chapels. Some days before the ceremony, the father, or head of the family, with three or four other of the principal relations, are chosen to perform the functions of priests, acolytes, or masters of the ceremonies. They choose by lot the day of the oblation, and prepare themselves for it by a three days' fast. On the preceding evening they examine the animals to be offered—pigs, goats, or others, and pour warm wine into their ears. If they shake their heads, they are regarded as proper for the sacrifice; if they do not they are considered as unclean. The animal chosen is then immediately killed in the presence of the officiating persons.

"On the day of the ceremony, all the relatives assemble in the chapel before cock-crow, and are ranged according to their rank. The wax lights placed on the altar are kindled, and incense and perfumes burnt on it; and then the master of the ceremonies cries with a loud voice, 'Let all bend their knees.' The persons present

thereupon make three genuflexions before the tablets, striking the ground with their foreheads; whilst one of the ministers recite certain forms of prayer.

"Afterwards, the master of the ceremonies cries, 'Rise!' and the assembly remains standing, whilst the principal person, who performs the function of priest, raises a cup filled with wine before the altar, and the master of the ceremonies says aloud, 'Oblation of wine.' He then tastes it, and pours out the rest on a figure of straw, placed near him. After this, he pulls out some of the hair of the animals immolated, and this hair and the blood is buried. The head and the flesh are raised on high, and offered before the tablets, the master of the ceremonies crying out, 'Oblation of goat or pork;' and he offers in the same manner, flowers, fruit, vegetables, silk stuffs, and paper money, which he burns before the door of the chapel, one of his assistants saying prayers the while.

"The solemnities being thus satisfactorily concluded, the master of the ceremonies announces to the assistants, that on account of the worship paid to their ancestors, they may expect all kinds of prosperity; health of body, abundance of the fruits of the earth, numerous children, honours, and a long life.

"As for the worship of Confucius, that philosopher has in all the towns a temple, not far from the 'Palace of the Lettered,' with his tablet, and an inscription in golden letters—'Throne or Seat of the Soul of the very holy and most super-excellent Grand Master Confucius.' Twice a year, namely, at the vernal and autumnal equinoxes, all the literati assemble there to do honour to Confucius by a solemn oblation, as their patron, and the father of Chinese philosophy. The first mandarin or governor of the town, performs the functions of priest, and names men of letters to assist him as acolytes and masters of the ceremonies, as in the ceremonial for the ancestors. After having kept a strict fast, the officiating persons prepare, on the eve of the equinox, fruits, rice, and liqueurs, to be offered to Confucius in the court of his temple; and the mandarin who acts as priest, burns incense and perfumes on a table, with wax lights, and kills the animals in the manner beforementioned.

"The same mandarin makes a profound bow to the pig chosen, which he repeats when the animal has been slaughtered in his presence by butchers. Afterwards the hair is shaved off, and it is kept with the blood for the following day, when before cock-crow, the mandarin, and other officers and literati, present themselves in great pomp in the temple of Confucius—burn incense on an altar illuminated with red wax candles, and at a signal given by the master of the ceremonies, chant sacred hymns and other pieces of music. Then, when the master of the ceremonies cries out, 'Let the hair and blood of the victims be offered,' the mandarin raises them on high before the tablet of Confucius. A procession is then

formed, and the assembly proceeds to the court of the temple, and buries the hair and blood. After that, every one returns to his place, and the master of the ceremonies cries with a loud voice, 'Let the spirit of Confucius descend!' and at these words, the mandarin takes a cup of wine, and pours it on the straw figure; at the same time, drawing the tablet of Confucius from its niche, he places it on the altar, and says a prayer containing the highest praises of Confucius.

"This is the first part of the sacrifice; the second is made in the following manner:—The master of the ceremonies cries out, 'Bend your knees,' and all bend accordingly—'Rise,' and all rise. Then the mandarin washes his hands, and receives from another officer a piece of silk stuff, and a vase full of wine. The master of the ceremonies cries, 'Let the sacrificer approach the throne of Confucius;' and immediately while the musicians sing, the sacrificer raises the silk and the wine, and offers them to Confucius, the master of the ceremonies commanding the assembly to kneel down and rise up again four successive times, which they do, bowing their foreheads to the ground each time. Then the silk stuff is burnt, with a prayer in honour of Confucius, and there are more prostrations, and an offering of wine with a prayer, in which the spirit of Confucius is addressed as present.

"The assembly then proceeds to the third part of the sacrifice, the master of the ceremonies exclaiming, 'Drink the wine of prosperity and felicity!' and 'Let us kneel.' Then he addresses himself to the sacrificer, with 'Drink the wine of felicity;' and the sacrificer drains the cup. After that, the master says, 'Take the flesh of sacrifice,' and the same sacrificer receives from one of the officers the flesh of the victims, and raising it in both hands, he offers it to Confucius, adding two prayers, of which the last concludes thus:—

"'All that we offer is pure and odoriferous; after having accomplished these ceremonies, we rest in peace, and the spirit is rejoiced. These sacrifices will enable us to obtain all kinds of felicities and good things.' At last the spirit of Confucius, which is supposed, after these invocations, to have descended and placed itself upon the tablet, is accompanied with solemn prayers back to its niche, and the ceremony terminates with distribution of the flesh of the victims among the assistants; those who eat of it hoping that all kinds of benefits will be procured for them by Confucius."—vol. iii. pp. 253-57.

It may seem difficult, on reading this precise and distinct statement of the religious character of the ceremonies, to understand how any hesitation could ever have taken place as to the impossibility of tolerating them. But Pere Huc well explains the circumstances by which the judgment of the first missionaries was influenced.

"The lettered class of China certified in the most positive manner, that these honours were, in their principle, purely civil, and had always preserved this character among them; and that the common people only had subsequently attached to them superstitious ideas that were foreign to them at their institution.

"Whether these men spoke according to their consciences, or that they wished to turn from their practices a disgraceful reproach, we shall not examine here; we must only maintain that a similar testimony given and repeated solemnly in various instances by the *élite* of a nation, was unavoidably much relied on by the foreigners who received it. It appears to us, that it might for many minds have afforded a moral certainty, sufficient for a justification before the tribunal of conscience; and this argument will acquire more force when we remember the difficulty the missionaries must have had to make out the truth at a time when they were still very imperfectly acquainted with the manners, customs, and language of this strange nation.

"The missionaries of the Society of Jesus, then, while recognising these ceremonies as superstitious for many of those who practised them, permitted Christians to participate in them under certain conditions. In the first place, they had to show that they were compelled to join in them by their position; and, secondly, they were required to think of them in the purely civil character which originally belonged to them.

"Looking at the matter from this point of view, the Jesuits had conducted themselves with regard to the temples of Confucius and the ancestors as if they were simply places of meeting without any religious character, and treated the sharing in the distribution of meats as the mere participation in a festival of a very allowable kind. They interpreted with still more facility the prostrations and other ceremonies, analogies to which could be found in the customs and intercourse of daily life. In this they were certainly mistaken; but, as has been shown, their error was excusable, and admitted of plausible interpretation.

"The Catholic Church, however, can tolerate nothing that may tend to injure the purity of its faith and morals, and it was, therefore, perfectly right that their doctrine should be condemned. At the moment when the Legate Apostolic quitted Europe for China, Pope Innocent XII. set on foot a thorough investigation of the question which divided the missionaries; and his successor Clement XI. had it continued with the greatest care in his presence, up to the 20th of November, 1704, when he confirmed and sanctioned the decisions of the Congregation of the Inquisition."—vol. iii. pp. 258-59.

The prohibitory decree of Clement XI. was in substance to the following effect. "As the true God cannot conve-

niently be named with European words, we must employ the words *Tien-Tchou*, that is to say, 'Lord of Heaven,' in use for a long time in China, and approved by both missionaries and their converts; we must, on the contrary, absolutely reject the appellations of *Tien*, Heaven, and *Chang-Ti*, August Emperor; and for this reason it must on no account be permitted that tablets shall be suspended in the churches with the Chinese inscription, *King-Tien*, 'Adore Heaven.'

"Further, the faithful of the Church of Christ must, on no account, and for no cause, be permitted to preside, serve, or assist in the solemn sacrifices or oblations that the Chinese are in the habit of performing at the two equinoxes of each year, to Confucius and their defunct ancestors, since these oblations or sacrifices are polluted by superstition. It must also not be permitted that in the buildings or temples of Confucius, called in Chinese, Miao, the said Christians shall perform any of the ceremonies, rites, or oblations offered in honour of the same Confucius every month, at the new and full moon, by the mandarins or first magistrates, before they take, or after having taken possession of their dignities,—or by men of letters, who, after having obtained their degrees, are in the habit of going to the temples of Confucius.

"Further, the Christians must not be permitted to perform the less solemn oblations in the temples dedicated to ancestors, nor to officiate or serve in them in any manner whatsoever, nor to practise in them any other rites or ceremonies. It must not be permitted to Christians, either separately or with pagans, to perform rites in honour of their ancestors before the tablets in private houses, nor at their sepulchres, nor to officiate or assist in them. After having well weighed all that has been alleged, for or against the ceremonies in question, it has been decided that they cannot be separated from what is superstitious, and that consequently they cannot be permitted to Christians, even though they should be preceded by a protest, public or private, of their not being practised as religious worship, but purely in a civil or political sense, and that the persons practising them do not ask or hope anything whatever from those to whom they are addressed.

"It must not, however, be supposed that this prohibition extends to the mere presence at the performance of such ceremonies, or to the purely material assistance that

Christians sometimes have to afford to the superstitious practices of pagans, provided always that they do not give any sign of approbation, tacit or express, to them, nor take any part in the ministerial functions connected with them, and that they cannot otherwise avoid incurring hatred or ruin.

"Finally, it must not be permitted to Christians to keep in their private houses the tablets of deceased ancestors, according to the custom of the country; that is to say, with the Chinese inscription, that it is the throne or seat of a certain spirit, even though this inscription should be in an abridged form. As for tablets which bear only the name of the deceased person, they may be tolerated, provided always that in the erection of them nothing takes place which savours of superstition, and that no scandal is occasioned,—that is to say, that the infidels cannot imagine that the Christians keep these tablets in the same spirit as they do themselves; further, it will be necessary in such a case to place near these tablets a declaration of what is the faith of Christians concerning the dead, and in what manner filial piety towards deceased parents and ancestors ought to be shown."—pp. 259-61.

This decree was received by De Tournon while he was at Pekin, urging on his difficult commission. The news soon reached the emperor, who was deeply offended, and who resolved upon demanding a public explanation from the legate during his solemn audience; and as the emperor was already committed to the opposite view, the result of the discussion which ensued, was the singular spectacle of a formal controversy between his Celestial Majesty and the representative of the Pope, or rather Monseigneur Maigrot, to whom De Tournon delegated the office of defending his views. Maigrot drew up a written argument, in which he alleged upwards of fifty texts of Chinese sacred writers in support of his opinion. The emperor's reply was, that Maigrot had misunderstood their meaning, and an unfortunate appearance of plausibility was given to the charge by an accident which occurred.

"It was not easy to confute the argument of the Bishop of Conon, except by maintaining that he had not perceived the true meaning of the Chinese authors; this, therefore, was the course taken, and it happened that this accusation of ignorance acquired

additional weight from a circumstance, trifling enough in itself, but which malicious ingenuity turned to good account.

"The Emperor Khang-Hi, after having read the Bishop's memorial, sent for him to the palace, and argued with him a long time. Wishing afterwards to test his knowledge of the Chinese language, he then proposed to him to read the four characters inscribed over the throne in the Hall of Audience. The prelate, his adversaries state, could only read two, and could not explain any; and thence it was inferred—reasoning from what is known of European language—that he was ignorant of the first elements of a branch of knowledge in which his friends had stated him to be deeply versed. It must indeed have been thought strange enough in Europe; but the Jesuits, who were aware of the singular structure of the Chinese language, would have shown more candour and integrity if they had not attached any importance to this incident. We are convinced that Khang-Hi himself, one of the most learned men in his empire, was by no means surprised to find the bishop at fault concerning a few characters, for there is not a member of the famous academy of Han-Lin who is not often obliged to have recourse to his dictionary, especially when he has to read anything upon a subject with which he is not familiar.

"We have ourselves seen excellent Chinese scholars stopped almost at every page in reading the catechism; and the bishop might really be a learned Sinologist, although he could not interpret an inscription concerning the throne of the Son of Heaven. It does seem to us, therefore, that his adversaries did not act with good faith when they cast upon him an imputation of ignorance, which has remained attached to his name in all subsequent histories."—vol. iii. pp. 267-68.

The result of such a conflict will readily be anticipated. Mgr. Maigrot remained firm in his view, notwithstanding the arguments and the authority of the emperor. "The firmness and apostolic independence of the bishop offended the pride of the Chinese monarch, who was weak enough to get into a passion, and give utterance to menaces which were not effectual in inducing his opponent to acknowledge that the Chinese ceremonies contained nothing contrary to the Christian faith. On this point his conviction was too deep for it to be possible to him to temporise, and this conviction gave him the courage to resist the imperial will, and not to allow himself to be deterred by the fear of the danger he might thereby incur.

"The attitude maintained by the Patriarch of Antioch and the Bishop of Conon so much exasperated the Emperor that every one began to dread the effects of his anger; and

at length, after the storm had been threatening in hoarse murmurs for several days, it burst forth on the 3rd of August, in the shape of two imperial decrees. The first was addressed to Monsigneur Maigrot, and commanded him, with expressions of strong displeasure, to retire to the interior of the Jesuits' residence at Pekin; the second was for the Patriarch of Antioch, and intimated that he was to make immediate preparation for a return to Europe.

"Monseigneur Maigrot complied with the orders of the Emperor, and retired to the Jesuits' House; but he was no sooner there than he was arrested with several other ecclesiastics belonging to the suite of the Patriarch of Antioch, and they were all loaded with chains, and taken before the tribunal of the Hereditary Prince, where they were subjected to many humiliating interrogatories, and the most insulting treatment. Little was wanting, indeed, for the prelate to have been condemned to death; and, on the report of the Prince, the Emperor issued on the following morning a decree of banishment against him. Two Christians and a catechist were at the same time beaten with rods, and exiled to Mantchuria."—pp. 268-9.

We must refer to Pêre Huc's pages for the details of the history which remain;—the expulsion of De Tournon from Pekin; the publication of his mandate; the oath required by Clement XI. of all missionaries to obey implicitly the apostolic decision condemnatory of the ceremonies; the elevation of De Tournon to the cardinalate; his imprisonment and death at Macao; the new mission of the Legate Mezzabarba; his contemptuous reception by the Chinese authorities; his actual conflict with Khang-Hi; the disputes which ensued both in China and in Europe; and the masterly resumé of the controversy, and final and authoritative decision of Benedict XIV.

On all this painful but most important history, Pêre Huc has written with singular clearness and moderation, and his narrative leaves little to be desired.

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

I.—*History of the Romans under the Empire.* By C. Merivale, B.D. Vol. VI. London: Longman, 1858.

This important work has advanced in the present volume to the Conquest of Jerusalem, and the preface announces its completion in two additional volumes. Our readers will recollect that the first three narrated the struggles for the establishment of the Empire, the next three conducting the narrative to the fall of the Julian Dynasty, on the death of Nero, and the elevation of the Flavian Family. We have already intimated our intention to reserve our complete notice of this publication until its completion; but we think it right to keep our readers informed of its progress, and with that view we proceed to notice some of the more interesting subjects which are comprised in the sixth volume. The invasion of Britain under Claudius, and the names of Caractacus and Boadicea, cannot fail to arrest the attention of every British reader, who will find a most clear and spirit-stirring account of these interesting events. The whole career of Nero is set forth with very graphic power, and will well repay the pains which the thoughtful student may bestow on it, and who may learn from it to appreciate the real difference between tyranny and liberty. We had anticipated that the present volume would have dealt with the great question of Christianity. This, however, is only partially the case; and we own to no small disappointment at the mode in which so much of this subject as it refers to is dealt with by our author. He appears to us to have greatly overrated the practical value and influence of heathen morality. It is true, indeed, that he collects numerous passages which prove the existence in books of the sublimest moral precepts; but the same may be predicated of every form of heathenism with which we are acquainted, and our age has abundantly demonstrated how absolutely valueless are all such abstract expressions when unsupported by the spirit of truth; and in fact the lowest conceivable forms of practical immorality is written on every line in our author's History. This exaggeration of the influence of heathen

morality naturally and necessarily compels Mr. Merivale to depress that of Christianity, and the result is, that in his opinion the Christian body in the time of Nero, was "obscure and inoffensive," and he all but ignores the existence of any substantial persecution. To account for this startling proposition the writer is obliged to "crave a fair consideration" for a theory of his own, after dismissing as untenable the conjectures of Gibbon. The theory rests upon what appears to us an unwarrantable and unsupported assumption that the Jews, by reason of "their appeals to the name of Christ as an expected Prince or leader," could not with any degree of propriety or probability have been charged by the populace of Rome with the practice of "Christ worship." (p. 281.) Our readers will recollect the very interesting discovery on the Aventine, at Rome, which we published in our Number for March, 1857, of the representation, scratched on a wall, of a human figure with an ass's head, crucified, a man in the act of worshipping it, with the inscription in Greek, "Alexamenos worships God;" and we established on the authority of the statement of Tertullian, that this could only be a caricature of Christian worship. Mr. Merivale (p. 564) appears to enlist this discovery in support of his argument, and refers it to the supposed worship of an ass by the Jews, referred to by Tacitus and Josephus, and to infer from it that the charge of "Christ worship" could not unnaturally be cast upon the Jews at Rome. Accordingly, his theory is that after the fire "the suspicions of the Roman mob were directed against the turbulent Jews—"

> "That these fanatics arrested and questioned not so much of the burning as of their political creed, sought to implicate the true disciples known to them, and hated by them, however obscure and inoffensive in Roman eyes, in the same charge,—that the true Christians thus associated in the charge of Christ worship, avowed the fact in their own sense, a sense which their judges did not care to discriminate,—that the believers became thus more or less sufferers, though doubly innocent, both of the fire and of political disaffection; finally, that our historians, misled by that false information, finding even in the public records that the name of Christ was the common Shibboleth of the victims, too readily imagined that the persecution was directed against the Christians only."

Such is the theory which we sincerely hope may be reconsidered by the author, and withdrawn when he shall

arrive at the complete history which we look for at his hands, of the rise and progress of Christianity. The volume concludes with narratives of the two great rebellions in Germany and Palestine, which terminated in the final overthrow of liberty and independence, in both those countries. We earnestly recommend this portion of the work to our readers, who will find the story told with most commendable perspicuity and spirit; and it is to us a matter of very sincere regret to meet with any drawback in our estimate of a work which, as a whole, must form an extremely valuable addition to the historical library.

II.—*Month of the Sacred Heart of Jesus*, translated from the French (from the eighteenth edition) by the Reverend George Tickell, S.J. London, Dublin and Derby: Richardson and Son, 1858.

We have one regret respecting this little publication, which is, that our notice of it will be too late to add to its circulation and utility during the present month, for which it is particularly intended. Once generally known, we are sure its popularity will equal, amongst English Catholics, that which it has attained to in France, where, since its publication in 1836, it has gone through eighteen editions, and where the annual sale averages upwards of 10,000 copies. To the "Month devoted to the Sacred Heart" thirty-three days are allotted, in commemoration of the number of the years of suffering that Sacred Heart endured for us upon earth; for each day is allotted a short, fervent meditation, with the usual introduction of a "practice," and of ejaculatory prayers. These meditations are full of matter, not verbose or lengthy, but simple and sincere in style. We can fancy nothing better for the use of persons living in the daily occupations of a busy life, but desirous of, in some degree, following the beautiful devotions of the month of June. They are preceded by an act of consecration to the Sacred Heart, and by a short instruction upon the motives and advantages of this pious practice.

III.—1. *The Life of St. Francis Xavier*, from the Italian of D. Bartoli, and J. P. Maffei. London, Jones, 1858.

2. *The Life of S. Charles Borromeo*, edited by Edward Healy Thompson, M.A. London: Burns and Lambert, 1858.

We have classed together these two biographies which require but little recommendation from us. Biographies

they are of the best kind, simple copious narratives of the heroic men, whose every word and action is a subject of edification. To both lives a preface is prefixed containing excellent instructions upon the ways of God with His Church. That to the life of St. Charles Borromeo is, we presume, by the editor of his life; that to St. Francis Xavier, is by the Rev. Father Faber, and like all his writings, highly valuable.

IV.—*Practical Sermons for all the Sundays and Holidays of the Year.* By the Rev. John Perry. London: Dolman, 1857.

These Sermons are short; more upon the plan of supplying copious heads to be amplified in discourses on meditations, than of being already prepared for delivery, but full of practical instruction, and well adapted to the spirit of the Church through the lapse of the ecclesiastical year.

V.—1. *Novena of the Sacred Heart of Jesus Christ.* By. F. Ch. Borgo, S.J. London, Dublin, and Derby: Richardson and Son.
2. *Bona Mors*; or the Art of Dying Happily in the Congregation of Jesus Christ Crucified and His Condoling Mother. London, Dublin, and Derby: Richardson and Son.
3. *A Short and Easy Introduction to the Holy Exercise of Meditation, according to the Method of S. Ignatius.* London, Dublin, and Derby: Richardson and Son.
4. *Book of the Confraternity of the Holy Family.* London, Dublin, and Derby: Richardson and Son.
5. *What Every Christian must Know.* London, Dublin, and Derby: Richardson and Son.
6. *The Little Office of the Holy Angels.* London, Dublin, and Derby: Richardson and Son.
7. *The Universal Prayer.* London, Dublin, and Derby: Richardson and Son.
8. *Memorial of Prayer.* London, Dublin, and Derby: Richardson and Son.
9. *Memorial of Resolutions and Rule of Life.* London, Dublin, and Derby: Richardson and Son.
10. *The Rosary*, adapted to the use of Little Children. London, Dublin, and Derby: Richardson and Son.
11. *Catechism for Confession*, with Examination of Conscience, &c., for Children. London, Dublin, and Derby: Richardson and Son.
12. *The Child's First Prayer Book.* London, Dublin, and Derby: Richardson and Son.

We include the above publications in one notice, not

because they are unimportant, nor on account of their small size and price, but because they do not require a separate recommendation from us, or many words of criticism. The object of these little books, all of which are issued from the Derby press, is perhaps sufficiently explained by their titles, and they appear to be well adapted for their purpose. The Novena to the Sacred Heart is a translation from the Italian, and will be acceptable to many English Catholics. The second little book is intended for the members of the Confraternity of the Bona Mors, and the object of the devotion is to secure the grace of a good death. There is a similar publication for the use of the Confraternity of the Holy Family; and *What every Christian must know*, is a useful epitome of Catholic faith and practice published with the *Imprimatur* of the Archbishop of Dublin, and intended for the use of the humblest classes. The *Memorial of Prayer* has Mr. H. Doyle's beautiful little sketch of Angels adoring the Blessed Sacrament, which is much superior to the other illustrations. Now that an improved taste in Christian art so generally prevails, both publishers and authors, (if the latter are sometimes indifferent, let the former feel their responsibility in this respect,) be careful to put forth no vignettes or other engravings which are not consistent with good taste and Christian feeling. The Messrs. Richardsons have some very excellent plates and woodcuts, but their illustrations are not always deserving of our encomiums, and they will, we are sure, take in good part our friendly hint. While on this subject, we must not omit to recommend to the patronage of our readers Mr. Philp's laudable attempt to popularise amongst us good religious pictures of the Dusseldorf and other Christian schools, an undertaking in which he is encouraged by the Cardinal Archbishop.

The three last publications on our list are intended for the use of children. The *Rosary*, and *Catechism for Confession*, have the *approbamus* of the Bishops of Birmingham and Nottingham; and the *Prayer Book* is the compilation of "a mother," who appears to have executed her task with much care and thought. These publications are all put forth at very low prices, seldom exceeding a penny, and we cannot but wish them a wide circulation.

VI.—*Domestic Annals of Scotland, from the Reformation to the Revolution.* By Rt. Chambers, F.R.S.E., &c. W. and R. Chambers, London, Edinbugh, 1858. 2 Vols.

The preface informs us that the object of the work is to detail the "occurrences beneath the region of history, the effects of passion, superstition, and ignorance in the people; the extraordinary natural events which disturbed their tranquillity; the calamities which affected their well-being; the traits of false political economy by which that wellbeing, and generally those things which enable us to see how our forefathers thought, felt, and suffered; and how, on the whole, ordinary life looked in those days." Mr. Chambers has abundantly performed his promise, and has added to his claims on the public gratitude, in no small degree. Whether he has thereby raised our opinion of the characteristics of his countrymen, is another question; for we must own to having formed from the perusal of the great majority of his details, a notion of the barbarism and ferocity of his country, greatly in advance of what we had conceived (and that was bad enough) from a very careful and repeated study of Mr. Tytler's History; and very greatly must it be for the benefit of all parties that (as we are all quite sure) the period which has elapsed since the accession of William the Third, has all but effected a complete fusion between England and Scotland. The "*perfervidum* genus" of Scotland, however, remains in its integrity, and we would fain hope will never again be aroused at the expense of our unhappy fellow Catholics. For it is melancholy enough to see how large a portion of these two large volumes is occupied with details of a most harrowing kind of the persecutions of Catholics carried on up to the end of 1688, when horrible outrages (detailed vol. 2, p. 499) were perpetrated at the Mansions of the Maxwells, and Lord Traquhair. The very copious index to this work, will enable the reader to trace the like proceedings through the whole of the annals; and were we not anxious to avoid the risk of stirring up the anger of our northern neighbours, we should transcribe an outline of this portion of these volumes for the enlightenment and warning of our Catholic readers. As it is, we will not set forth any of these details, but refer to the almost equally

numerous and shocking acts of the persecution of the unhappy witches and wizards who figure in these pages; and that long after such persecution had been put an end to on our side of the border. The work is so completely anecdotical, that any selection of particular passages would convey no idea of the character of the rest of the two volumes. But perhaps we cannot better shew the extraordinary contrast of our own times with the manners of 1688-9, than by the following transcript.

"About this time" (Jan. 1688) an Englishman describing Scotland from personal observation, says: "Their drink is beer, sometimes so new, that it is scarce cold before it is brought to table. But their gentry are better provided and give it age, yet think not so well of it as to let it go alone, and therefore add brandy, cherry brandy, or brandy and sugar; and this is the nectar of their country at their feasts and entertainments, and carries with it a mark of great esteem and affection. Sometimes they have wine, a thin bodied claret at tenpence the mutchkin, which answers to our quart."

Mr. Chambers adds this comment:

"It is evident from this that whiskey as yet formed no conspicuous indulgence among the Scottish people. They had come however to be much given to another stimulant which has ever since had a great fascination for them. 'They are fond,' says the English observer, 'of tobacco, but more from the sneesh box than the pipe, and they have made it so necessary that I have heard some of them say that should their bread come in competition with it, they would rather fast than their sneesh should be taken away. Yet mostly it consists of the coarsest tobacco dried by the fire and powdered in a little engine after the form of a *tap*, which they carry in their pockets, and is both a *mill* to grind and a *box* to keep it in.'"

Probably the change from beer to whiskey may, in the end, prove one of the greatest curses which could have fallen on the country. Although our author (vol. 1. pp. 2 and 3) speaks of "blinded by the Catholic priesthood," their "sloth and luxury," and talks of confessing to "shavelings," we cannot but own that the general spirit of his comments is highly liberal and praiseworthy; and we most highly recommend the perusal of this very entertaining work to all who delight (as we do) in the genuine annals and authentic expositions of national character.

VII.—1. *Book of Popular Ballads.* London: Burns and Lambert.
2. *Book of Poetry for the Young.* London: Burns and Lambert.
3. *The Early Martyrs.* 2 vols. By Mrs. Hope. London: Burns and Lambert.
4. *Life of St. Francis Xavier.* London: Burns and Lambert.
5. *Anecdotes and Incidents, Ecclesiastical and Religious.* London: Burns and Lambert.

The above series of pretty volumes is the first step in a most judicious movement for the extension to the humbler classes of Catholics of the blessing of a literature at once really solid, attractive, interesting, and after its own kind, light, and elegant. It is a great thing to have placed within their reach, as has already been done in many ways, and by many zealous hands, an abundant supply of directly religious books, sound and healthful in their tone, free from the coldness and insipidity of many of the older models, and calculated at once to elevate the devotional feelings of the people and to direct them to truly Catholic objects and views. For their constant and unwearied exertions to effect this end, Messrs. Burns and Lambert have earned the warmest thanks of the Catholic community. The various series which they have issued, have all, in their several ways, been directed to this common object; and none of the many volumes which have come from their active press, appear to us better calculated to promote it than the charming little books now before us. The selection of Ballads, of Anecdotes, and of Poetry for the Young, is most pleasing and judicious. The Life of St. Francis Xavier has all the interest of a religious romance, and Mrs. Hope's delightful volumes on the Early Martyrs are of a nature to carry the young mind back to the days of first fervour, with a salutary influence which it is impossible to overrate.

At the same time, the undertaking in itself is one which can only be adequately carried out through the cordial and generous co-operation of the Catholic body, and especially of those who are directly charged with the care or education of the young. To them it peculiarly recommends itself by the very claim to their patronage which it possesses; and we trust that the success of this important experiment will prove a new stimulus to the zeal, enterprise, and taste of its spirited projectors.

INDEX TO VOL. XLIV.

Abbots, persecution of, under Henry VIII., 465.
Abercius, 147.
Accusations of Protestants against Catholics of opposing science, 379.
Africa, recent explorations, by Livingstone, 158—difficulty of exploration, ib.—climate, 159—ignorance about Africa, ibid.—Dutch inhabitants of, 160.
Ambrose, St., 149
Aphides, observations on, 386.
Ascension, the emblems of, in the catacombs, 138.
Audley, 285.
Austria, disputes of the Pope with, 251.
Angus, Earl of, his divorce, 472.
Avignon, papal court at, 51-52—reasons for the Pope's removing there, 53, 54.

Bacon, Nicholas, 289.
Baikie, Dr, extracts from his travels, 163.
Baptism, necessity of, 124—its administration to unborn infants, 126.
Barth Dr., in Africa, 167.
Beguines, their origin and rules, 65.
Bible, authorized Protestant version of the, 183—incorrect translation, 184—different significations of words used, 189—fertility of the Greek language in which it was written, 192—faults of punctuation, 194.
Bill, Indian, discussion on, 370.
Bohringer, quotations from, 88.
Boniface, Pope, VIII., 50—his death, 51.
Bonn-r, 287.
Books, notices of, 261, 526.
Bourchier, life of, 282, 283.
Bribery during Walpole's administration, 352.
Buildings, gothic, discomforts of, 217-218.
Burnet, Bishop of Wells, 279.
Byng, Admiral, death of, 354—alleged reasons for his execution, 354, 355.

Calvinists, German, their offer to make Henry Emperor, 24.
Campagna, Roman, 297.
Carteret, Lord, his dismissal from the council, 385.
Catacombs of Rome, 170.
Chatham, Lord, 365.
China, persecution of priests in, 503—their banishment, 504—their recall, 506—success, 507.
Chinese ceremonies, controversy on the, 510—524—decision at Rome respecting them, 516—nature of the ceremonies, 518—circumstances by which the missionaries were influenced, 521—prohibitory decree of Clement XI, 521—its effects, 524.
Cholera, exertions of the Pope, during the, 157.
Cholmley, Sir Roger, 288.
Christians, early, their zeal, 130.
Churchill Dr., his advocacy of craniotomy, 107, 110, 112, 113.
Church, Catholics' obedience to the, 375.
Churches in Rome, 295.
Clement XI., his decree on the Chinese ceremonies, 521.
Commons, House of, origin of the, 342.
Convent, Armenian, in Venice, 292.
Converts, state of, 214—influence of the Church on, 215.
Craniotomy, 106, 110—seldom practised in Catholic countries, 115, 116.
Creation Haydn's, 403.
Crotchets and crotchettiness, 200—Crotchet, signification of the word, 202, 203, 204—difference between crotchet and crotchettiness, 211.

Dulti, an African tribe, 165, 166.
Dutch, the, in Africa, 160.
Duplessis Mornay, his character and exertions, 16, 17, 27.

Earth, period of its existence, 390.
Elias, 140.
England, Froude's history of, 445.
Explorations by Maillet and others, 161.

Families, great, now existing as at the end of the Revolution, 348.
Fitzwilliam, Lord, his history, 349.
Flagellants, 68.
Florence, Cascine at, 293.
Forest, Prior of the Observants Convent, his execution for treason, 467.
Foss, his judges of England, 269.
France, union between her and Turkey, 7-8.
Franciscans, heresy among the, 62, 63.
Francis of Sales, St., his admiration of Henry iv. 4.
Francis 1st, his union with Soliman against Charles 5th, 7.
Friends of God, their doctrine, 39, 40.
Froude's accusations against the Pope, of sanctioning assassination, 471.
Froude's History of England, 445—reasons he assigns for Henry's divorce, 445, 446—conduct he attributes to the Pope, 452—alleges a spirit of persecution in Catholics, 454.

Gaeta, the Pope's flight to, 254.
Gardiner, 286.
Geology and Protestantism, 375.
Giffard, Bishop of Winchester, 273.
Gospel according to St. John, revised by five clergymen, 181.
Goths, a word to the, 200 extracts from, 201, 202.

Handel's Messiah, 395.
Haydn's Creation, 403.
Henry 8th, reasons for his divorce, 445—indignation of the people against him, 450.
Henry 4th, state of politics at the commencement of his reign, 2, 3—political motives for his change of religion, 3—his letter to his ambassador, 8.—his religious views, 10—his death, 30—designs imputed to him, 23—his threats against the Turks, 25.
Heresy, Manichean, spread of, 58. 59.
Heresies in the 14th century, 67, 68.
Hillard's six months in Italy, 290.
Hobbes, abbot of Woburn, his death, 462.
Howard Catherine, her downfall, 476.
Hunt, slave, in Africa, 167, 170.
Huc, Pere, his History of Christianity in China, 501—his account of the controversy on the Chinese ceremonies, 513-524.

Ignatius, letters of Saint, 412—discovery of, 413 doubts of their being genuine, ib.—attempts of Protestants to disprove the doctrine of the Real Presence from his letters, 414. 415—evidence of Eusebius, Bishop of Cesarea, 423. 424—of Theodoret, 425—of St. Jerome, ib.—of St. Ephrem, ib.—of St. Polycary, 426—use of conjunctive particles, 428, 429.
Immortality, the dogma of, 306.
India Bill, discussion on, 370.
Infants unborn, the practice of destroying them unchristian, 102, 103—the signs of death often fallacious, 104—importance of bringing them to baptism, 107—their destruction in no case permissible, 110—how often it really takes place, 114—Cæsarian operation, 115—practice of leaving them in the dead mother's womb, 121—earliest period of their viability, 122—when the soul in them is united to the body, 123—do not die with the mother, 127.
Institutions, human, as precursors of Divine, 328. 329.
Inscriptions, early Christian, 146.
Italy, six months in, 290—charity, public, 294.

John XXII., quarrel between him and Louis of Bavaria, 60—his refusal to confirm Louis, 61.
—— (St.) of the Cross, quotations from, 86.
Judges of England, 269.

Knowledge, scientific, danger to religion in defective, 379, 380, 383.

Labour, premature, in childbirth, 119—in what cases lawful, ib.
Letter of Henry IV. to his ambassador, 8.
Lingard's, Doctor, new version of the Four Gospels, 181.
Livingstone, Dr., recent African exploration, 158—account of himself, 172—attacked by the Boors under Pretorius, 173—encounter with a lion, 174—Lake Ngami, 175—Tsetse, the, account of, 176—Ambaca, district of, 177—Tampan, bite of the, ib.
Louis of Bavaria, his opposition to the Pope, 61.
Luther, his remarks on the war against the Turks, 5, 6—his teaching, 13.
Lutheranism, its opposition to Calvinism, 12—its decline, 13.

Mai, Cardinal, account of, 237—his writings, 239.
Marriage, proposed between Henry's daughter and an Infant of Spain, 17.
Maguire's work on Rome, 442.
Mazzini, 249, 255.
Messiah, the, by G. F. Handel, 395—rapidity of its composition, 398—its first appearance, 399.
Mezzofanti, Cardinal, 235—his death, 236.
Midwifery, its practitioners, 100—instructed to destroy unborn children, 106—Cæsarian operation advocated, 115—the inducing of premature labour, 118.
Milman, Dr., his accusations against Tauler, 37.
Miller's testimony of the Rocks, 375.
Miracles, supposed natural causes of, 388.
More, life of, 284.
Morality, respecting unborn children, objectionable, 102, 106, 108, 114
Moses, allusions to him in the Catacombs, 131.
Mosaic of St. Sabina, 137.
Murder of Cardinal Rossi, 252.
Murchison, Dr Roderick, 161.
Mysticism, its presence in all ages, 76.

Newman, Dr., his new version of the Scriptures, 199.
Nicholas of Bale, 37.
Nobles, tyranny of, 338, 344.
North, Earl of, administration of, 367.
Notices of books, 261, 528.

Palma, Monsignor, death of, 253.
Pallium, true signification of the, 143.
Paulet, Marquis of Winchester, 288.
Peter, St., as represented in the Catacombs, 132, 133—the recognition of his mission, 135 his emblems, 139—evidences of his primacy, 130—receiving the keys, 139—guiding the vessel, 145—his position with regard to St. Paul, 153.
Pius VII., interview with, 227.
—— IX., personal description of, 244—early life, 245—made Archbishop of Spoleto, 246—made Pope, 248—his dispute with Austria, 251.
Place of honour, difference between the Greeks and Latins, 156.
Planets, probability of their being inhabited, 385.
Pitt, Mr., his administration, 357—his efforts to bring about war with Spain, 358.
Plan for the division of Europe, 22.
Prison at Pentonville, number of Catholics there, 488—disadvantages of the Catholics, ib.—influence of priests upon the prisoners, 493—changes necessary in prison discipline, 495—objections answered, 498.
Popes, four last, 219.
——— place of their interment, 157.
Porson, M. A., history of Henry IV., 1—his Gallicanism, marked by dislike of the Holy See, ib.—exclusive use of French documents, ibid.
Power, royal, renewed attempts for the subversion of, 344—45.
——— love of, its influence on politics, 368.
Portuguese settlements, effect produced by the suppression of religious orders, 178.
Priests, as compared with the Protestant clergy, 296.

Principles, Manichean, spread of, 58, 59.
Protestantism in favour with the Turks, 6—its progress in Europe, 11—cause of its success, 12—its decline, 11, 13.
Prussia, position of Catholics in, 2, 4, 1.

Ranulph, Flambard, 271.
Ravaillac, 30.
Reformation, its effect on the position of the Turks in Europe, 5.
Rocks, testimony of the, or Geology in its bearings on the two theologies, natural and revealed, by Miller, 375.
Rome, disturbed state of, 54, 55.
——— her past and present position, 220—government of, 222—exercise of charity, 223, 224.
Rossi, murder of Cardinal, 252.

Salisbury, Roger, Bishop of, 274.
Schall, Father, his sufferings in China, 503.
Schmidt's, Professor, remarks on the "Friends of God," 38.
Science opposed to Protestantism, 376—as found in the Holy Scriptures, 377.
Sheriffs, powerlessness of the, 341.
Slave hunt in Africa, 167, 170.
Smith's Thorndale, 299.
Soul the, earliest period of its union with the body, 123—its spiritual condition, 124.
Soldiers, German, and their equipment, 18, 19—their success, 20.
Struggles, English party, 337.
Specklin's notices of Tauler, 45.
Spenser, Earl of Sunderland, 351—his intrigues for power, ib.
Stratford, Bishop of Winchester, 279.
State of religious feeling in the 14th century, 51.
States, Papal, state of parties in the, 56, 57—societies, secret, 57.
Sully, his plans and influence, 26, 27.
Surrey, Earl of, his execution, 481.
Suso, his writings, 73—quotations from his writings, 89, 97—his character, 98.
Supremacy of the Church of St. Peter, 220.

Tablet, 485—correspondence between the visiting Priest of Pentonville and the Secretary of State, 485, 487, 488.
Tampan, bite of the, 177.
Tauler, 31—enthusiasm for him, ib.—translations of his works, 32—his conversion, 36—accusations of Dr. Milman against him, 37—extracts from his sermon, 41, 78—charge against him of disaffection to the Church, 42—his publications, 47—his exhortations, 47, 48—his reappearance, 68—his sermons, 70, 71—extract from his sermons, 91.
Thomas, St. a Becket, 275.
Thorndale, or the conflict of opinion, 299.
Threats of Henry against the Turks, 25.
Tsetse, account of the, by Dr. Livingstone, 176.
Turks, their love of Protestantism, 6.

Union, protestant, formed by Henry IV., 23.

Veils, remarks on as a headdress, as compared with bonnets, 293.
Verbiest, Father, defends the persecuted priests in China, 503—declares the Chinese calendar inaccurate, 505—result, 506—his efforts for restoration of banished priests, ib.—his influence with the emperor, 507.

Werner of Urslingen, 18.
Whigs and Tories, difference between, 369.
Will, free of man, 325.
William of Wykeham, 281.
Winkworth, Miss, 32.
Wiseman's Cardinal, four last Popes, 219.
Wriothesley, 288.



RICHARDSON AND SON, LONDON, DUBLIN, AND DERBY.

his

isit-
y of

ula-
36—
37—
arge
, 42
47,
79,

176.

ared

iests
ndar
for
nflu-